

**A thesis
for
the degree of Master of Arts (Asian Studies), East Asian Studies
The Australian National University**

Title: *Nogami Yaeko - A life of ideas*

Student's name: **Mariko Nakamura**

July 1996

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 General remarks	5
1.2 Style and patterns of conflict in Nagami's works	10

Chapter 2 Biography (Life and literature)

2.1 Daughter of a wealthy rural family in southern Japan	12
2.2 Usaki and its historical background	13
2.3 Natsume Soseki, Nagami's teacher	15

I certify this thesis is written entirely on the basis of my own research, unless otherwise indicated.

2.4 <i>Shosha</i>	23
2.5 <i>Primo</i> to 1939	25
2.6 The 1940s	26

Mariko Nakamura

Mariko Nakamura

2.7 1940s and after	31
2.8 1950s and after	34
2.9 Nagami's study of philosophy	35
2.10 The influence of <i>Noh</i>	36
2.11 Nagami as a diligent writer	36
2.12 Towards the end of her life	38

Chapter 3 *Mabo*

3.1 Introduction	40
3.1.1 The Political and social situation in Japan prior to 1930	
3.1.2 Why <i>Mabo</i> took twenty years to complete	
3.1.3 Important characters prefigured in previous works	
3.1.4 The structure and plot of the novel	
3.2 Shōji's background	57
3.2.1 The Early Shōji student movement	
3.2.2 Marism Japanese intellectuals and the end of the student movement	

Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

- 1.1 General remarks 5
- 1.2 Style and patterns of conflict in Nogami's works 10

Chapter 2 Biography (Life and literature)

- 2.1 Daughter of a wealthy rural family in southern Japan 12
- 2.2 Usuki and its historical background 13
- 2.3 Natsume Sōseki, Nogami's teacher 15
- 2.4 Marriage 19
- 2.5 Seitōsha 23
- 2.6 Prior to 1920 25
- 2.7 The 1920s 26
- 2.8 Between 1930 and the end of the Second World War 28
- 2.9 After the war 31
- 2.10 1960s and after 34
- 2.11 Nogami's study of philosophy 35
- 2.12 The influence of Noh 36
- 2.13 Nogami as a diligent writer 36
- 2.14 Towards the end of her life 38

Chapter 3 *Meiro*

- 3.1 Introduction 40
 - 3.1.1 The Political and social situation in Japan prior to 1930
 - 3.1.2 Why *Meiro* took twenty years to complete
 - 3.1.3 Important characters prefigured in previous works
 - 3.1.4 The structure and plot of the novel
- 3.2 Shōzō's background 57
 - 3.2.1 The Early Shōwa student movement
 - 3.2.2 Marxism, Japanese intellectuals and the end of the student movement

3.3	Patterns of conflicting ideas in <i>Meiro</i>	60
3.3.1	Fascism and "humanism"	
3.3.2	Blindness and clear-sightedness	
3.3.3	Ambivalence within Nogami	
3.3.4	Individual freedom and traditional convention	

Chapter 4 *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*

4.1	Introduction	74
4.1.1	Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536 or 1537-1598)	
4.1.2	Sen no Rikyū (1522-1591)	
4.1.3	The mystery of Rikyū's death	
4.2	<i>Meiro</i> , books and studies influencing <i>Hideyoshi to Rikyū</i>	82
4.2.1	<i>Hideyoshi to Rikyū</i> in relation to <i>Meiro</i>	
4.2.2	<i>The Apology</i> , <i>The Republic</i> and <i>The Man Within</i>	
4.3	The structure and plot of the novel and its conflictual patterns	87
4.3.1	Sophisticated urban artist vs. peasant risen to power	
4.3.2	Rikyū's enemy and ally	
4.3.3	Contradiction within Rikyū, his final victory, and <i>wabi-cha</i>	
4.3.4	Victory as a passing phenomenon and victory in eternity	
4.4	Nogami's Rikyū	97

Chapter 5 Conclusion

5.1	General remarks: the objectives and the results	100
5.2	Nogami's blind spot	102
5.3	Limits of Japanese intellectuals	104
5.4	Possibility of further research	107

Bibliography	109
--------------	-----

Appendix (Chronological record)	114
---------------------------------	-----

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 General remarks

Nogami Yaeko (1885-1985) is an author well known and respected in Japan but relatively unknown in the West. In my view her novels, *Meiro*¹ in particular, compare favourably with many of the great works of world literature. Reading the three volumes of *Meiro* gave me the same deep satisfaction which I found in reading Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy or Dickens. The contemporary Japanese novelist, Kaga Otohiko, an admirer of Dostoyevsky, also praises Nogami as a great novelist, saying that *Meiro* has every element which great novels have.²

Nogami herself admired these European authors, particularly Dickens.³ Like these authors, she has a profound grasp of human character. While describing particular people in particular social and historical circumstances, she deals with such universal issues as love, justice, fear of death and the ambivalence of human nature. She gives these issues emotional depth through her treatment of the lives of her characters. Her storytelling skills also evoke the great nineteenth-century European authors. Her intricate descriptions of characters, scenes and events follow one another without weakening the unity and coherence of the story.

Nogami's work comprises fiction (short stories, plays, novels, children's stories), accounts of journeys, essays and translations. Her first published work was a short story, "Enishi"⁴ (1907), which appeared in the literary magazine *Hototogisu*⁵ thanks to the

¹ *Nogami Yaeko zenshū*, first series (23 vols., 3 suppl. and Geppō gappon, hereafter *NYZ I*), vols. 9, 10 and 11, Iwanami Shoten, 1980-1985. *Nogami Yaeko zenshū*, second series (31 vols., hereafter *NYZ II*) appeared, also from Iwanami, 1986-1991. In this thesis I have not translated the titles of literary works.

² Kaga Otohiko, "Ai to sensō no kōzu - *Meiro*", *Bungei tenbō*, 5 (Tokyo: April 1974), pp. 223-235 and "Nogami Yaeko no chōhen shōsetsu", *Shinchō*, 81:6, (Tokyo: June 1984), pp. 243-260.

³ "Josei no me o sekai e" (1951), *NYZ I*, suppl. 1, pp. 147-162.

⁴ *NYZ I*, vol. 1, pp. 3-15.

⁵ *Hototogisu* started in 1897 as a *haiku* magazine. By 1906, it had changed from a poetry to a general literary arts magazine, but it reverted to *haiku* in 1912. Natsume Sōseki published his first

support of the great Japanese novelist Natsume Sōseki.⁶ She kept writing until she died in March 1985, only weeks before her one-hundredth birthday. She claimed to be a slow writer, but because her career spanned nearly eighty years, she was able to produce a substantial body of work. Nogami's writing skills, her knowledge of human character and of history and her diligent approach to her art are brilliantly brought together in her last three novels, *Meiro*, *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*⁷ and *Mori*,⁸ although *Mori* was left uncompleted at her death.

Most Japanese intellectuals in the early 1900s were severely challenged by the new ideas that had flooded into Japan after the end of national isolation a few decades earlier. Christianity and Western philosophy were particularly influential, and Nogami's life and work exemplify this influence.

In this thesis I would like to examine Nogami's work mainly through *Meiro* and *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. These works in particular display her strengths as an author, clearly showing the influence of her encounter with Western philosophy. She had written many short stories and a novel before them, but in my view, her true ability is best shown by what she wrote after she turned sixty. In her sixtieth year the Second World War ended and she restarted work on *Meiro*, the first two chapters of which had been written in 1936 and 1937. The year the war ended was a turning point for her as well as for Japan as a whole. She felt a new freedom, together with some pride that she had not supported Japanese militarism either before or during the war.⁹

Meiro and *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* belong to different categories. One is entirely fictional, the other is based on well-known historical figures. *Meiro* has one main character plus many secondary characters and has a contemporary setting; *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* concentrates on very few people and on the tense relationships among them, and

novel, *Wagahai wa neko de aru*, in *Hototogisu* in 1905. See Kokushi Dai Jiten Henshū Iinkai, ed., *Kokushi dai-jiten*, 14 vols., (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), vol. 12, p. 772 and *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*, 9 vols., (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1983), vol. 3, p. 237.

⁶ I will discuss the relationship between Nogami and Natsume Sōseki in section 2.3, "Natsume Sōseki, Nogami's teacher".

⁷ *NYZ I*, vol. 13.

⁸ *Mori* (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1985), was republished in 1991 as *NYZ II*, vol. 28. In this thesis all quotations from *Mori* are from the Shinchōsha edition.

⁹ Diary entry of 28 March 1953, *NYZ II*, vol. 11, p. 386.

the setting is the Azuchi-Momoyama period (1573-1600). However, both novels ask roughly the same question: What is the principle of our lives and how should we live? Although I believe that *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* shows Nogami at her highest level as a novelist, I consider *Meiro* her greatest work. This apparently contradictory statement will be explained in the course of the thesis.

Despite its length, *Meiro* never bores the reader. With its panoramic and multi-layered structure, the work vividly describes absorbing characters. Not only the people Nogami had met or heard of, and Japan's social and political situation, but also many works that Nogami had read provided materials for her literary imagination. One of these works was Ernst Toller's¹⁰ (1893-1939) "Briefe aus dem Gefängnis"¹¹ (Letters from Prison). She must have drawn from this book great understanding of those who were imprisoned because of their beliefs. This understanding finds expression in the main character of *Meiro*, a young man who once embraced Marxism and then, after imprisonment, renounced it. *Meiro* conveys Nogami's intense compassion for human beings, especially for their weaknesses and failures. I believe that it gives these feelings more vivid expression than does *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. This feeling of compassion drove Nogami to complete the novel, even though the task took twenty years (if one includes the ten year interlude from 1937 to 1947).¹²

The cultural critic Karaki Junzō (1904-1980), whose *Sen no Rikyū* (1958) provided materials for *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, wrote in the postscript to the new edition (1963):

Nogami's novel ... takes a historical form. However, she has done much research in relevant materials and in field trips. Therefore her novel is consonant with the evidence. By means of her literary imagination, Nogami Yaeko links detail to

¹⁰ A German playwright. From 1919 to 1924 Toller was imprisoned for participating in the 1919 Communist uprising in Bavaria. After being forced by the Nazi regime to leave Germany in 1933, he lived mostly in the United States, where he committed suicide in 1939. His best-known work is *Man and the Masses* (1920). See "Toller, Ernst", *Microsoft (R) Encarta* (Microsoft Corporation, Funk & Wagnall's Corporation, 1994).

¹¹ Toller's letters were written between 1919 and 1924 to his family, friends, other writers and prison authorities. Nogami seems to have read the English translation, "Look through the bars" (1936). See Diary entries of 19 and 24 June 1936, *NYZ II*, vol. 5, pp. 116 and 120.

¹² According to Nogami's diary, she started to incubate the full version of *Meiro* immediately after the war, but she actually started to write it in 1947. See Diary entry of 17 June 1947, *NYZ II*, vol. 9, p. 483.

detail, which academics cannot do. She has built up a clear image of Rikyū.¹³

It took Nogami about five years in her mid seventies to write *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. This novel suggests an older, calmer and more reflective Nogami, who concentrates more on the inner life of human beings. She seems to be interested in the fact that human beings generally have many aspects to their personalities, some of them conflicting. Her own mental struggle, obvious in *Meiro*,¹⁴ becomes distant or controlled in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. Although her diary of the time shows that she was not free from the upheavals of writing, the reader of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* senses the presence of a skilful novelist writing with ease at the height of her powers.

Nogami's novels underline the importance of morality, individualism, humanism, equality and democracy. These ideas, while present in Japanese culture, had always found it difficult to take root - and this difficulty remains. After Nogami learned and realised their importance she was forced to witness Japan moving in a direction that denied these ideals. Both novels were written after the bitter experience of the war. Both address strong messages to the Japanese people. In *Meiro* she describes, through the life of a young intellectual, how ordinary people and political leaders actually lived before and during the war, and she asks the reader how both groups ought to have lived. Thus she questions the nature of love, peace and pacifism, and examines the meaning for Japan of such Western ideas as humanism, democracy and individual freedom. In *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, Nogami examines the importance of living in accord with principles and questions what real individual freedom is as she depicts that rarity, a genuine seeker after truth in the person of the tea ceremony artist Sen no Rikyū. In this novel she explores the above Western ideas, individualism in particular, in the foreign environment of medieval Japan.

Nogami herself was not free from the limits of her time. For instance, she believed at one stage that Stalin was a great leader. In her diary entry of 4 March 1953, when she heard the news that Stalin was seriously ill, she wrote: "... losing him from our

¹³ Karaki, *Sen no Rikyū* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963), p. 231. All translations from this thesis are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

¹⁴ According to Ōe Kenzaburō, in writing *Meiro* Nogami demonstrated maternal love and sympathy towards those who were involved in the stormy Marxist movement in Japan. Ōe Kenzaburō, recorded lecture, "Hontō ni chiteki na ikikata - Nogami Yaeko to sono jidai", *Shinchō kasetto kōen*, Shinchōsha, 1992.

world now will be an irrecoverable loss. I feel as if a great void has opened somewhere on the earth".¹⁵ (But who among the intellectuals was openly critical of Stalin at this stage?) There is also her rather odd hesitation (discussed later in this thesis) to criticise publicly Emperor Hirohito and the Japanese imperial system, even well after the war. However, despite these limitations and shortcomings, Nogami's message is universal, expressed through her treatment of the particular.

Before I turn to the style of Nogami's work, I would like to mention briefly the circumstances of my study of Nogami. Since she is virtually unknown in the West and does not get the recognition she deserves even in Japan, there is little material available on her work. The only available monograph on Nogami is Sakasai Hisako's *Nogami Yaeko*.¹⁶ I have therefore relied almost entirely on Nogami's own writings (largely via inter-library loan), particularly the nineteen volumes of her diary and the four volumes of her letters.¹⁷

I should also mention Janet Walker's *The Japanese Novel of the Meiji Period and the Ideal of Individualism*,¹⁸ in which she discusses Futabatei Shimei's *Ukigumo* (1887-1889), Kitamura Tōkoku's essays (written in the early 1890s), Tayama Katai's *Futon* (1907), Shimazaki Tōson's *Hakai* (1906) and *Shinsei* (1919). Unfortunately I only become aware of Walker's book when my thesis was almost finished. However, I must acknowledge that, if I had obtained her book earlier, my thesis may have taken a somewhat different approach. Although I examine a number of aspects of Nogami's work, my main theme is the influence of Western ideas, especially individualism. Nogami was clearly aware of the importance of Tayama Katai's *Futon* and Shimazaki Tōson's *Hakai*,¹⁹ both Meiji-era novels that Walker identifies as key to an understanding of

¹⁵ NYZ II, vol. 11, p. 375.

¹⁶ Sakasai Hisako, *Nogami Yaeko* (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1992).

¹⁷ Nogami's diaries and letters were published after her death. They are included in NYZ II, vols. 1 to 17(3) and vols. 24 to 27 respectively. Her existing diaries start in 1923 and go through to 1985, several weeks before her death. Her diaries before 1923 were lost during the Great Kanto Earthquake (1 September 1923).

¹⁸ Janet A. Walker, *The Japanese Novel of the Meiji Period and the Ideal of Individualism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

¹⁹ See the 1953 essay "Bungaku to seikatsu", NYZ I, vol. 21, pp. 327-340.

individualism in Japanese literature. Katai and Tōson, along with Sōseki, were thus direct predecessors of Nogami.

1.2 Style and patterns of conflict in Nogami's works

Nogami's four novels (*Machiko*, *Meiro*, *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* and *Mori*) show significant patterns of conflict - clearly in the first three, more subtly in *Mori*. In these works, militarism, materialism, love of power or blind obedience to oppressive power are to be overcome, and humanism, spirituality or humanity are to be pursued, in order to gain love, individual freedom, justice and truth through criticism and resistance.²⁰

Nogami studied philosophy with Professor Tanabe Hajime for about ten years from her mid-sixties.²¹ She repeatedly said that she found this study extremely useful in her writing. She learnt dialectics from Tanabe, and saw him as the second greatest influence on her writing after Natsume Sōseki.²² According to her diary, she understood the dialectical triad of thesis, antithesis and synthesis from reading Plato, Hegel, Marx and Kierkegaard under Tanabe's direction.²³ This philosophical idea influenced the use of conflict in her fiction.

Nogami's themes and patterns of conflict are not unique. What gives her works great power, however, is her intricate development of philosophical issues through her treatment of specific human characters and events. This intricacy is not expressed in the manner of a philosophical essay. The French novelist, Marcel Proust (1871-1922) wrote the following in his famous novel *Remembrance of Things Past*:

²⁰ I will discuss Nogami's conception of 'humanism' and 'freedom' in chapter 3. Western words are sometimes used very differently in Japan. James Heisig writes in his article "The Religious Philosophy of the Kyoto School": "When borrowing words from Western languages, the Japanese typically take their flat, surface meaning only. They have no way to turn inside and unlock the door to associations of feeling or history through literature". T. Unno and J.W. Heisig, ed., *The Religious Philosophy of Tanabe Hajime*, (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1990), pp. 12-42. As a Japanese intellectual, Nogami does not escape this criticism completely.

²¹ I will discuss this episode in section 2.11, "Nogami's study of philosophy".

²² *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 278.

²³ Diary entry of 17 October 1953, *NYZ II*, vol. 11, pp. 531-534. I will discuss the relationship between dialectics and Nogami's work further in chapter 4.

Style for the writer, no less than colour for the painter, is a question not of technique but of vision: it is the revelation, which by direct and conscious methods would be impossible, of the qualitative difference, the uniqueness of the fashion in which the world appears to each one of us ... And it is perhaps as much by the quality of his language as by the species of ... theory which he advances that one may judge of the level to which a writer has attained in the moral and intellectual part of his work. Quality of language, however, is something the theorists think they can do without, and those who admire them are easily persuaded that it is no proof of intellectual merit.²⁴

The style of Nogami's writing lends itself to the treatment of philosophical issues. She uses her literary imagination on the materials she has researched and develops her thoughts with a writer's freedom and story-telling skill - a skill which enables her to create fictional worlds with their own powerful reality.

In *Love's Knowledge*, the American philosopher Martha Nussbaum writes of Henry James' *The Golden Bowl* (1904) that: "James frequently compares the author's sense of life to soil, the literary text to a plant that grows out of the soil and expresses, in its form, the soil's character and composition".²⁵ In Nogami's case, in the soil of her sense of human life, including its social and political dimensions, *Meiro* grew through her strong ethical sense, exploring pacifism, humanism, Marxism, democracy and individual freedom. *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* is the flower of her deeper search into human nature and individualism through a tightly-knit pattern of conflicts.

In what follows I will look first at Nogami's life and literary career. I will then discuss the "plants", Nogami's great works, *Meiro* and *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, examining in each background, structure, plot, philosophy, and patterns of conflict. In the final chapter I will discuss Nogami in the larger context, together with the steps taken by Japan from the chaotic end of the Second World War to the well-developed society of today. I will discuss the political aspects of Nogami's work together with the issue of Japanese intellectuals in her time particularly in chapters 3 and 5.

²⁴ Marcel Proust, *Remembrance of Things Past*, (1913-1927), cited in Martha Nussbaum, *Love's Knowledge - Essays on Philosophy and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 2.

²⁵ Nussbaum, *Love's Knowledge*, p. 4.

Chapter 2 Biography (Life and literature)¹

2.1 Daughter of a wealthy rural family in southern Japan

Nogami Yaeko (maiden name Kotegawa) was born in May 1885, the daughter of Kotegawa Kakusaburō and Masa in the small town of Usuki in Oita Prefecture, Kyushu. Her father, a wealthy sake brewer, gave her what was for a Japanese girl at that time a good education. Besides attending primary school, she studied Chinese (*kanbun*), Japanese classics such as *The Tale of Genji*, and English at private institutions.²

In 1900 Nogami went to Tokyo to enter Meiji Jogakkō³ (Meiji Girls School), introduced by Kinoshita Naoe⁴ via her uncle Kotegawa Toyojirō. This is related at the beginning of Nogami's last novel *Mori*. Only a few girls in rural Japan had this kind of opportunity. The fact that this was a Christian school was not considered significant by Nogami's parents, who were largely indifferent to matters of religion, although the Kotegawa family was officially connected to a Jōdo Shin-shū temple. They simply hoped that Meiji Jogakkō would give Nogami a good education.

In Tokyo Nogami lived with her uncle Toyojirō, an economist with a doctorate from the University of Michigan. Toyojirō, a hunch-back, became the model for the central character in four of Nogami's early stories, which belong to the genre of social

¹ I have consulted Senuma Shigeki, "Nogami Yaeko no sekai", No. 1-21, *NYZ I*, Geppō gappon, in writing several sections of this chapter.

² See the 1942 essay "Sono koro no omoide" and the 1981 interview "Omoide no naka no hitobito", *NYZ I*, vol. 19, pp. 466-481 and suppl. 2, pp. 409-424.

³ Meiji Jogakkō was established in 1885 in Tokyo to educate young Japanese women on the basis of Christian teachings. In 1892 Iwamoto Zenji, a magazine journalist, Christian leader and girls' educator in the Meiji era, became the second principal, a role he fulfilled until the school was closed in 1908. From 1885 Iwamoto had published the magazine *Jogaku zasshi*, advocating improved education for Japanese girls/young women. Meiji Jogakkō was a seed-bed for the women's rights, women's literature and romantic literature movements (Shimazaki Tōson and Kitamura Tōkoku, leaders of the so-called romantic literature movement, were teachers at this school for a time). Nogami was a student at Meiji Jogakkō between 1900 and 1906. See *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 13, p. 735.

⁴ Kinoshita Naoe (1869-1937) was a Christian-socialist activist and author in the Meiji era. His best-known work is the anti-war novel *Hi no hashira* (1904). *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 4, p. 186.

literature.⁵ Her first three years as a student at Meiji Jogakkō are described in her last, autobiographical novel, *Mori* (1985).

Nogami owed her English competence to Meiji Jogakkō.⁶ At the school they did not use the English textbooks recommended by the education department, but read instead the original texts. Nogami later said that Meiji Jogakkō had a very free liberal atmosphere, and that she never heard of *Kyōiku Chokugo* (the Imperial Rescript on Education) at the school.⁷

In August 1906, several months after graduating from Meiji Jogakkō, Nogami married. This step was apparently undertaken as a means of continuing her studies, because if she had gone back to Kyushu further study would have been almost impossible.⁸ She wanted to stay in Tokyo. It was at that time that she seriously started to write.

2.2 Usuki and its historical background

Nogami's home-town, Usuki, is well known as a medieval fortress town in Oita Prefecture. Its castle was built by the daimyo Ōtomo Sōrin (1530-1587). The Ōtomos had been the *shugo*, military governors, of the province of Bungo (the old name for the largest part of Oita Prefecture) throughout the Muromachi Period (1338-1573). In 1569, after a series of battles, northern Kyushu fell under Sōrin's control.

Saint Francis Xavier (1506-1552) arrived in Kagoshima in 1549 in order to propagate Christianity. Sōrin invited him to Bungo province and received him warmly. Under Sōrin's patronage, the Jesuits established an infant refuge (1555), a hospital (1557) and a college (1580) in Funai (another town in Bungo), as well as a novitiate (1580) in Usuki, where Sōrin stayed (in preference to the capital, Funai) after he became close to Jesuit priests. Ōtomo Sōrin is said to have sent a delegation of Japanese youths

⁵ "Sumiko", "Junzō to sono kyōdai", "Okayo" and "Kurutta tokei", all were published between 1923 and 1925.

⁶ Nogami read authors such as Washington Irving and Henry Longfellow in the original English. See *Mori*, p. 19. This competence led her to translate many works. All her translations are in volumes 18-23 of *Nogami Yaeko zenshū II*.

⁷ "Ryokuin kanwa", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 215.

⁸ See Nogami's essays, "Sensei de ari tomodachi de atta otto", *NYZ I*, vol. 19, p. 347 and "Tsuma to haha to sakka no tōitsu ni ikita jinsei", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 128.

to the Pope in Rome in 1582. Usuki was called "Rome in Bungo". Sōrin was baptised in 1578 and did not change his Christian status until his death, although his conversion caused strong resistance among the Buddhists in the province. His conversion also resulted in his divorcing his Buddhist wife. Sōrin, praised on the one hand by the Jesuits as an ideal ruler, was, on the other hand, condemned later in chronicles of the Edo period (1600-1868) as an arrogant and lecherous man.⁹

Christianity's rising influence in Bungo province was curtailed by the Anti-Christian Edicts issued in July 1587 by Toyotomi Hideyoshi¹⁰ (1536-1598) only a month after Sōrin's death. Sōrin's son Yoshimune and his successors tried to protect themselves and their province by destroying all signs of Christianity and building many Buddhist temples. Devoted Christians went underground, earning the name "*kakure-kirishitan*" (hidden Christians), as in other parts of Kyushu. However, three centuries later, when Nogami was a child, the descendants of *kakure-kirishitan* were just strange or rather mysterious entities for the people in Usuki. According to Nogami, the first and last priority of contemporary Usuki residents was business. They would not have believed stories of Usuki in the era of Ōtomo Sōrin.¹¹

Nogami wrote and talked about Usuki many times throughout her life.¹² Usuki's historical background was to provide material for her literary imagination. She read Xavier's letters and admired his adventurousness,¹³ and for many years she wanted to write a novel based on Ōtomo Sōrin's life. She was encouraged in this ambition by a number of her friends. While the novel was never written, the main character in *Meiro*, Kan'no Shōzō, studies Sōrin's life and the early history of Japanese Christianity, and questions whether the purpose of Sōrin's baptism was to become a real Christian or to become successful in trade with Europe. This was Nogami's own question. She wrote a short essay about Ōtomo Sōrin in 1964, "*Kirishitan-daimyō no koseki*".¹⁴ In 1973, a

⁹ On Ōtomo Sōrin, see *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 2, pp. 655-656.

¹⁰ Toyotomi Hideyoshi appears in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*.

¹¹ *Mori*, pp. 24-26.

¹² Ōe Kenzaburō makes this observation in his recorded lecture, "*Hontō ni chiteki na ikikata*", with surprise that Nogami never repeated herself when discussing Usuki, but always provided new aspects of the town itself or new thoughts about the town.

¹³ Diary entry of 10 November 1949, *NYZ II*, vol. 10, p. 276.

¹⁴ *NYZ I*, vol. 22, pp. 296-300.

story about Sōrin seemed to be in her mind. In a letter to Shinoda Kazushi, a literary critic, she wrote: "In order to write [about] Sōrin, [I would have to] read a lot of Christian [historical] materials because of his deep relationship with the priests. It is too much for me [now] and [therefore] I have left it aside".¹⁵ Even as late as 1984, less than a year before she died, she showed her regret that she had not written about Sōrin. She said that she was fascinated by the historical meaning of the man and the Western culture which he brought to Japan.¹⁶

2.3 Natsume Sōseki, Nogami's teacher

The encounter with the great novelist Natsume Sōseki (1867-1916) decided Nogami's fate as a writer. When she married Nogami Toyochirō (1883-1950), also from Usuki, in 1906, he was a student at Tokyo University studying English literature and interested in Noh. Toyochirō was a follower of Natsume Sōseki and Nogami came to know Sōseki through her husband. Sōseki taught English literature at the university until 1907, although he was already a famous writer with the success of his 1905 novel *Wagahai wa neko dearu*. Since Toyochirō was visiting Sōseki regularly, Nogami was able to borrow books from Sōseki by authors such as Jane Austen, George Eliot and the Brontë sisters. Nogami was never officially a disciple of Sōseki. She never attended the regular meetings of Sōseki's so-called Mokuyō-kai (Thursday Society), because Toyochirō did not like her to go out, especially to places where there were many men. But she knew of the Mokuyō-kai discussions through her husband. She wrote in her diary entry of 26 February 1951 that: "... my husband used to bring back the content of the meetings as a present. Therefore I knew what was happening in society, though I stayed at home. That was how we lived".¹⁷

Nogami visited Sōseki several times and Sōseki also visited her at home.¹⁸ Other followers of Natsume Sōseki at that time were Naka Kansuke¹⁹ (1885-1965), Morita Sōhei²⁰ (1881-1949), Abe Yoshishige²¹ (1883-1966) and several other aspiring young

¹⁵ Letter 1647, *NYZ II*, vol. 27, p. 79.

¹⁶ "Furusato no rekishi to ai", *NYZ II*, vol. 29, p. 436.

¹⁷ *NYZ II*, vol. 11, p. 25.

¹⁸ "Are mo kore mo kakitai", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, pp. 154-157.

¹⁹ Best known for *Gin no Saji* (1913).

writers and academics. Abe Yoshishige was a good friend of Nogami and Toyoichirō, and Naka Kansuke was to play an important role in Nogami's married life.

After Nogami married Toyoichirō she set herself to write. Her first work, "Meian",²² was not published in her lifetime. When it was written, however, Toyoichirō, who knew his wife's talent, took it to Sōseki. Sōseki seems to have recognised Nogami's potential and wrote her a long letter full of advice.²³ Nogami said in her nineties that if she had not receive this letter she would probably have abandoned writing, and that if Sōseki's had advised her to give up writing she would have done so.²⁴ It is an interesting coincidence that Sōseki's last novel and Nogami's first story have the same title. "Enishi" (1907), Nogami's first published work, was the second work seen by Sōseki. He helped to get "Enishi" published and continued to give Nogami advice on most of her early works.²⁵

Nogami's early writing style was the so-called *shaseibun* (literary sketch), about which she learnt a lot from Sōseki. *Shaseibun* was originally introduced into Japanese literature by a famous haiku-poet, Masaoka Shiki (1867-1902). According to Shiki, it is very hard for a human being to imagine anything except what he previously has actually seen or heard. Therefore, creative writing involves the rearrangement of materials already seen or heard.²⁶ Shiki got the initial idea of literary sketch from the theory of the sketch held by some painters among his friends, and used it to give a new aspect and freshness to *haiku* by describing the inspiration he got from observing scenes of nature. *Shaseibun*, according to Shiki, describes what is actually observed, not only natural phenomena but also human affairs, as they are seen, thus deepening and widening the meaning of the words.²⁷ Shiki wrote of the basic attitude understanding *shaseibun* in

²⁰ Morita is well-known for *Baien* (1909) and *Hosokawa Garasha Fujin* (1949-1950).

²¹ A critic and philosopher. His well-known works are "Nihonjin toshite" (1948) and "Ichiriberarisuto no kotoba" (1953). I will refer to Abe again in the final chapter.

²² *NYZ II*, vol. 28, pp. 1-61.

²³ It seems that Nogami is the only woman writer whom Natsume encouraged or supported.

²⁴ "Mukashi no hanashi, ima no hanashi", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 390.

²⁵ "Sakka ni kiku", *NYZ I*, vol. 21, p. 389.

²⁶ Masaoka Shiki, "Kenbun igai", *Fude makase* (first pub. Tokyo: 1889), *Shiki zenshū*, 22 vols., 3 suppl. (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1975-1978), vol. 10, pp. 75-76. See also Maeda Ai, "Shiki ni okeru kiroku no mondai", *Kokubungaku*, 31:12, (Tokyo: October 1986), p. 30.

²⁷ Takumi Hideo, "Shiki, 'shasei-ron' no genryū", *Kokubungaku*, 31:12, pp. 90-97

"Jojibun":²⁸

In order to make readers find it interesting when they read passages about what the author thought interesting, [the author] should not decorate his words, nor add exaggeration, but just trace what he saw as he saw it.

After Masaoka Shiki died his disciples, principally the well-known haiku poet and writer Takahama Kyoshi (1874-1959), continued to develop the literary sketch, using their magazine *Hototogisu*. Nogami later praised Kyoshi's effort to spread *shaseibun*.²⁹ Natsume Sōseki's first novel, *Wagahai wa neko dearu* was published in *Hototogisu*, and clearly showed this influence.³⁰ For Nogami, *shaseibun* influenced her writing for the rest of her life. In her case, the heart of *shaseibun* was the search for a link between objects and their meanings. She was very thankful for her training in the literary sketch under Sōseki.³¹ The following passages from her novels show this influence. This style of writing is common in European literature, but at the time these novels were written, it was not common in Japanese literature. The following passage describes an opportunistic and powerful politician who enters the Japanese military cabinet during the Second World War. Nogami writes:

[He] was a little over sixty and of well-nourished, stout build. His large, close-cropped head with grey, hard and dense hair, gave an expression of animal-like cruelty, as did the precipitously flat back of his head, which was connected to the top of a thick, red neck of the same thickness and width. ("Satsuki-sai", Chapter 1 of *Meiro*)³²

As does this paragraph, the following passage shows a typical characteristic of Nogami's *shaseibun* in which the description of a person's appearance and mannerisms explains his/her nature:

He [Ishida Mitsunari] has a slender appearance. He has thick eyebrows and long-slitted eyes on his pale thin face. Both ears jut out to the left and right of his shiny black hair and his Adam's apple forms a pointed bump under his bony

²⁸ Masaoka Shiki, "Jojibun", (first pub. Tokyo: 1900), *Shiki zenshū*, vol. 14, pp. 241-249. See also Nakajima Kunihiro, "Shiki no shaseibun, Hakushū no shōhin", *Kokubungaku*, 31:12, pp. 121-122.

²⁹ "Shaseibun e no yorokobi to kitai", *NYZ I*, vol. 23, p. 242.

³⁰ According to Nogami, Takahama Kyoshi strongly encouraged Sōseki, a fact very important in Sōseki becoming a novelist. See "Omoide no naka no hitobito", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 419.

³¹ *NYZ II*, vol. 17(1), p. 242. There are three volumes of *NYZ II*, vol. 17.

³² *NYZ I*, vol. 9, p. 44.

jaw. His appearance reveals at first sight his nervous temperament ... however, his manner in performing the morning greeting to Hideyoshi and the way he moves his jaw slightly to the amanuenses who are leaving the room show that he is fully qualified for the position of number-one advisor in Hideyoshi's intellectual entourage. (Chapter 2 of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*)³³

The next passage describes a rural scene in Karuizawa (in Nagano Prefecture). There are many similar descriptions of Karuizawa in *Meiro*. Nogami seems to have loved Karuizawa. Kaga points out that she obviously enjoyed creating a love story (*Meiro*) against the backdrop of this town:³⁴

While it gradually became cloudy, the grey air turned to a veil of fine water-drops and wrapped around everything. The things that had existed a moment ago suddenly disappeared. The forest, trees, houses, and roads melted into the dim light so as to make one wonder whether it was dawn or dusk. It was a strangely fresh sight in which sometimes it looked as if the universe had returned to the [original] chaos, while at other times only the pointed tops of the pine trees floated alone and a red roof oozed into view between air currents that flowed slowly and dimly. ("Karuizawa", Chapter 1 of *Meiro*)³⁵

Nogami was also strongly influenced by Sōseki's principle that a writer should be diligent. She kept trying to improve her work by researching the context of her stories, and she was uncompromising with what she saw as deficiencies in her own work. She said later in an interview, referring to the early period of her life as a writer, that Sōseki was always her model, and therefore she thought that she should never write at reckless speed nor be carried away by critics.³⁶ This attitude lasted throughout her life as a writer. She also learnt from Sōseki about individualism, about the importance of abiding by her own principles rather than following received ideas, especially those promulgated by the state. This is probably one of the reasons why she was not swayed either to the

³³ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 47. I will return to Nogami's description of the appearance of Ishida Mitsunari in Chapter 4, as an example which shows the person's character by describing his appearance. For more details of the relationship between Kyoshi, Sōseki and Nogami in terms of *shaseibun*, see "Natsume Sōseki", NYZ I, vol. 23, pp. 270-282.

³⁴ Kaga, "Ai to sensō no kōzu", *Bungei tenbō*, 5, p. 231.

³⁵ NYZ I, vol. 9, p. 145.

³⁶ NYZ I, suppl. 2, p. 274.

right or to the left by the ideological storms which were powerful and forceful realities in Japan, especially in the early 20th century.

Nogami's encounter with Sōseki gave her faith that she could become a writer. She appreciated her good fortune in not having to struggle to get her early works published, thanks to Sōseki.³⁷ She referred to Sōseki as "Natsume sensei" throughout her life. Sōseki was indeed the teacher of both Nogami and her husband Toyoichirō. Her diary entry of 9 December 1925 records that her husband visited the Natsume family on the anniversary of Sōseki's death and that she wished he were still alive.³⁸ This wish reappears every now and again in her diaries and interviews.

Another debt Nogami owed Sōseki concerns *utai*, the sung part of a Noh play. Sōseki had a long interest in *utai*, and he sometimes practiced with a professional Noh actor. The followers of Sōseki, including Nogami's husband, also practiced *utai*. When Toyoichirō graduated from university he took *utai* lessons with a Noh actor and introduced Nogami to it as well. She wrote in her 1935 essay "Shunchū"³⁹ about the experience of overhearing Sōseki's *utai* lesson with the Noh actor Onoe Mototarō and her strong sense of gratitude to Onoe for his singing. *Utai* became Nogami's life-long hobby. The relation between Nogami and Noh was very deep and strong. I will discuss this at a number of points in this thesis.

2.4 Marriage

Nogami did not talk much about her private life. Her relationships with her family and with her husband Toyoichirō in particular, are hardly seen in her works or public speeches or interviews. She kept a clear distance from *shishōsetsu*, the "I story", the autobiographical novel written with the writer in the first person role, which was the main stream of Japanese literature. However, one can see revealed in her surviving diaries, which were written from 1923 to shortly before her death in 1985, over sixty years of private life. In these diaries there is not only the diligent writer Nogami Yaeko, but also Nogami as a mother, a wife and a woman.

³⁷ See NYZ II, vol. 14, p. 295.

³⁸ NYZ II, vol. 1, p. 345.

³⁹ NYZ I, vol. 19, pp. 27-33.

When Nogami met Toyoichirō, she was still studying at Meiji Jogakkō. Toyoichirō seems to have been first introduced to Nogami as her private English tutor. Despite the difference in social background (Toyoichirō was from a lower social class) and against both the custom of arranged marriages and her father's wishes, they married in 1906, when Nogami was twenty-one, several months after her graduation from Meiji Jogakkō. Theirs was a so-called "free marriage", which was very rare at that time. Nogami did not have any intention of going back to Usuki, far away from Tokyo, because she wanted to continue studying.

Nogami's married life looked ideal. She said that Toyoichirō was her elder brother, a teacher and friend as well as a husband. They had three sons, Soichi, Moki-chirō and Yōzō, born in 1910, 1913, and 1918. Nogami did not lose any of her sons during the Second World War, and all ended up as academics. They lived close to their mother, both physically and emotionally, throughout her life. Soichi said of his mother that she taught her sons Greek wisdom and Christian humanism.⁴⁰ While a young mother she wrote, in the typical style of *shaseibun*, several stories about her sons: "Atarashiki inochi" and "Itsutsu ni naru ko" were published in 1914,⁴¹ and "Chiisai kyōdai", originally "Futari no chiisai bagabondo", in 1916.⁴² In "Atarashiki inochi" Nogami examines the meaning of life and from there she also looks deeply into the fate of human beings. This search continues in "Chichi no shi" (1915)⁴³ in which she describes her father's death.

Towards the end of "Chiisai kyōdai", Nogami criticises the enthronement ceremony of the emperor and the general attitude of Japanese towards Christmas. About the former, she suggests clearly, although reservedly, that there is no social equality in Japan and common Japanese do not have freedom of speech. She then criticises the way Japanese treat Christmas without any religious principle.⁴⁴ I agree with the Japanese philosopher, Tanikawa Tetsuzō, who said that "Chiisai kyōdai" belongs to the category of the social novel.⁴⁵ In my view, this story marks the beginning of Nogami's move from

⁴⁰ NYZ I, Geppō gappon, Geppō 7, p.12. I will discuss "humanism" as understood by Nogami in section 3.1.3, "Important characters prefigured in previous works".

⁴¹ NYZ I, vol. 2, pp. 75-93 and pp. 105-126 respectively.

⁴² NYZ I, vol. 3, pp. 87-192.

⁴³ NYZ I, vol. 2, pp. 207-246.

⁴⁴ NYZ I, vol. 3, pp. 172-184.

⁴⁵ NYZ I, Geppō gappon, Geppō 5, p. 9.

being simply a writer of *shaseibun* to an explorer of social issues.⁴⁶

Despite her appearance of being a happily married woman, a contented mother and a successful writer, Nogami's diaries reveal that her marriage was a constant struggle. It was her life-time secret that she was once in love with another writer, Naka Kansuke, also a follower of Sōseki. Evidence for this appears throughout her diaries. Nogami wrote a number of times about Naka (although his name is not clearly written for a long time, it becomes clear later to whom she is referring), and the troubles she had with Toyoichirō because of Naka. She said that without knowing this secret, nobody could really understand her life.⁴⁷ On 4 of May 1965, the day Nogami learned of Naka's death, she wrote in her diary:

... but I did not have any tears. Many and various memories of long ago passed in my head. That was all. [I don't know whether it was because of] the composure of an old [woman] or the hardening of an old heart. Whatever it is, the big secret in my past is gone from the earth.⁴⁸

When and how this (possibly Platonic) love affair started and ended is not clear. Nakamura Tomoko argues that it was before she married Toyoichirō.⁴⁹ However, I think it was in the early stage of her marriage. She wrote the following passage in her diary entry of 12 February 1929, comparing the different attitudes towards love held by French, Russian, British, and Italian men and women:

In Japan there is none [no true love], not in any form. I don't know about the future but at present [there is none]. This is because men are too conceited and women are frivolous and silly, and neither knows the taste of real romance. Unfortunately 20 years ago I myself could not escape this criticism. I destroyed the most beautiful romance in my life because I was carried away by a temporary emotion caused by the then popular humanism.⁵⁰

Twenty years before 1929 is 1909, and Nogami married in 1906. Therefore when "the most beautiful romance" happened she was a married woman. It is hard to understand what she meant in the last sentence in the above diary entry. I think it means that

⁴⁶ Nogami's mild criticism of the emperor is not repeated in her more mature works, where it would really have counted. See chapter 3 below.

⁴⁷ Examples include *NYZ II*, vol. 15, p. 537, vol. 16, p. 780 and vol. 17(3), p. 167.

⁴⁸ *NYZ II*, vol. 15, pp. 80-81.

⁴⁹ Nakamura Tomoko, *Ningen - Nogami Yaeko* (Tokyo: Shisō no kagakusha, 1994), p. 18.

⁵⁰ *NYZ II*, vol. 2, p. 343.

she decided not to leave her family because of the expected sorrow of her children and husband if they had lost her. She also wrote the following in her diary entry of 2 April 1973, when she was eighty-seven, visiting Somei bridge. (Somei, an area of Tokyo, was where she lived immediately after she got married.):

He also used this bridge when he came from Kohinata [another area of Tokyo]. I'm not sure now, but it must have taken at least one hour and a half [to get here]. He was about 24 or 25. Without sincere feeling [towards me] one could not do such a thing. However, [when I look back now I feel that] everything was a dream in this insubstantial world.⁵¹

Naka Kansuke was living in Kohinata, Koishikawa-ku (currently Bunkyo-ku), Tokyo when he was this age. Since both she and Naka were born in the same year, she was also 24 or 25 years old at that time. She was therefore already married.

As already noted, Toyochirō was interested in Noh and was to become a well-known Noh scholar. The couple often enjoyed Noh performances together. When Toyochirō published a book on the subject, *Nō no kenkyū to hakken*,⁵² Nogami wrote in her diary on 23 February 1930 that this made her happier than the publication of her own work.⁵³ From Nogami's point of view, however, Toyochirō was not a scholar by nature. He preferred going out and meeting people to researching. This seemed to disappoint Nogami, who would have preferred him to spend his time studying.⁵⁴

Nogami was distressed every now and again in her married life by the jealousy of Toyochirō. She said in her diary entry of 9 January 1927 that Toyochirō always tried to explain all the restraints which he placed on her by referring to his love for her. However, she was determined not to move from the position that true love should not give pain to the partner.⁵⁵ Toyochirō did not allow her to go out freely. But Nogami later admitted that her early married life without freedom made her work diligently. In her diary entry of 20 January 1965, written when she was seventy-nine, Nogami wrote the following about her past with Naka:

⁵¹ NYZ II, vol. 17(2), pp. 45-46.

⁵² Nogami Toyochirō, *Nō no kenkyū to hakken* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1930).

⁵³ NYZ II, vol. 3, p. 20.

⁵⁴ See NYZ II, vol. 5, p. 115.

⁵⁵ NYZ II, vol. 2, p. 4.

My memories are not all beautiful. Even ours [Naka Kansuke and Nogami's] were not. They were painful and tormenting decades [because of these memories and Toyoichirō's jealousy]. However, I now feel how lucky we [Naka and Nogami] were not to go beyond that very subtle encounter. If we had gone beyond that, I cannot imagine how wrong my life could have been. I would have thrown literature away. The reason why I could have built up [this comfortable] old age as it is now in such good form was that I have walked in a different way from his [Naka Kansuke's].⁵⁶

When Toyoichirō died in 1950, he was the president of a private university, Hōsei Daigaku. Nogami was at his bedside. She was always thankful to Toyoichirō for employing two or more maids even though he could barely afford to do so, especially at the early stage of their marriage, so that his wife should not need to spend much time on house work. He and their three sons accepted Nogami's wish to spend half of every year in their summer house by herself in order to have a much-needed quiet environment for greater concentration. Between July 1944 and February 1948 Nogami stayed in Kita-Karuizawa all year basically by herself, while Toyoichirō stayed in Tokyo with one of their sons, avoiding the bombing of Tokyo and the post-war chaos. Later she came to appreciate the freedom to write which she had enjoyed under Toyoichirō's tolerance. Her diary entry of 21 August 1956 reads:

The relationship between [Toyoichirō] and me was not as sweet as people generally imagine. However, his resentment and hatred were, together with his indubitable love, all good for me. I must thank him [for all of them] first of all, because they were all mental food for me to grow on [as a writer].⁵⁷

Although they had their disagreements and occasional conflicts, Toyoichirō was supportive of Nogami's ambition as a writer.

2.5 Seitōsha

In the early 1900s, the feminist organisation Seitōsha (Bluestocking Society), which lasted from 1911 to 1916 with a membership of mostly well-educated young women, published the literary magazine *Seitō*. *Seitō* was well known for publishing the

⁵⁶ NYZ II, vol. 15, p. 14.

⁵⁷ NYZ II, vol. 12, p. 476

works of Yosano Akiko⁵⁸ (1878-1942) and Hiratsuka Raichō (1886-1971). The latter wrote the well-known prose-poem "Genshi josei wa taiyō de atta" (In the Beginning Women were the Sun).⁵⁹

Although Nogami was not prominent in Seitōsha, she supported it by sending stories to *Seitō*, beginning in 1912. *Seitō* was dominated by contributions about women's problems in marriage and society. Nogami's contributions were also in that category, describing instances of the injustice suffered by Japanese women in the Meiji era. She also contributed children's stories to *Seitō* as well as to other magazines, and she sent in a translation of the book, *The Biography of Sonya Kovalevskaya* by the Swedish writer Anne Charlotte Leffler (1849-1892). It was published in *Seitō* in 1914 and 1915. Nogami greatly admired Sonya Kovalevskaya (1850-1891), a brilliant mathematician, writer and, according to Nogami, the first female professor in the world. Nogami wrote several essays about her⁶⁰ emphasising that Kovalevskaya was not only a great academic but also a human being with a great depth of love and passion, full of tears and hope. When Nogami was asked in an 1976 interview whom she identified with most closely, she answered Sonya Kovalevskaya.⁶¹

A friend whom Nogami met through Seitōsha, Itō Noe (1895-1923), took over the editorship of *Seitō* from Hiratsuka Raichō in January 1915. Because of their friendship Nogami continued to support *Seitō*, though she never felt close to any other members. Itō Noe was later murdered, together with the anarchist Ōsugi Sakae, Noe's then de facto husband, by the military police during the chaos following the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. Nogami's sadness at Noe's fate is shown in her November 1923 essay "Noe san no koto"⁶² and in several other essays and interviews.

⁵⁸ A female poet, well-known for her poetry collection *Midare-gami* (1935).

⁵⁹ *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*, vol. 7, p. 54.

⁶⁰ Examples include "Sekai saisho no daigaku joshi kyōju, Sōnya Kovalevskaya", *NYZ I*, vol. 18, pp. 372-393, "Sōnya Kovalevskaya", *NYZ I*, vol. 20, pp. 263-332, "Sōnya Kovalevskaya no koto", *NYZ I*, vol. 23, pp. 339-342.

⁶¹ *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 283.

⁶² *NYZ I*, vol. 18, pp. 74-81.

2.6 Prior to 1920

Nogami continued to publish short stories, translations and children's stories. Her main works up to 1920 are: "Chichioya to san'nin no musume" (1911),⁶³ in which Nogami expresses the European concept of self-consciousness and the importance of self-control in order to preserve freedom and individuality; a translation (*Densetsu no jidai*) of *The Age of Fable*⁶⁴ by Thomas Bulfinch in 1913, undertaken in order to provide a good book for her sons;⁶⁵ and stories including "Atarashiki inochi" (1914), "Chiisai kyōdai" (1916),⁶⁶ and "Hahaoya no tsūshin" (1919),⁶⁷ all of which also shows Nogami's interest in issues such as militarism and the role of the emperor.

Sōseki admired and encouraged Nogami's translation work. He wrote a long preface for "Densetsu no jidai" when it was published as an independent volume. In the preface he praised Yaeko's translation as a "Bible for researchers of foreign literature" and went on:

... I am really impressed by your patience and the effort with which you completed the translation of "Densetsu no Jidai" while you were also doing housework ... It would not be an easy job even for a professional male translator. [Therefore] it must have been a heavy workload for a housewife who looks after her husband and children, and her younger brother. You seem to be surprised that it took you eight months to complete the translation. I, however, am impressed by your speed.⁶⁸

This is patronising, perhaps, but Nogami did not see it that way. She later said that she always thought of Natsume Sōseki as her reader, even after his death, and this caused her to rewrite again and again until she thought he would be satisfied.⁶⁹

⁶³ First published in *Hototogisu*, NYZ I, vol. 1, pp. 229-297.

⁶⁴ NYZ II, vol. 19, pp. 11-493.

⁶⁵ NYZ I, Geppō gappon, Geppō 7, pp. 11-12.

⁶⁶ On "Atarashiki inochi" and "Chiisai kyōdai" see section 2.4, "Marriage".

⁶⁷ NYZ I, vol. 4, pp. 3-49.

⁶⁸ NYZ II, vol. 19, p. 521.

⁶⁹ "Natsume sensei no omoide", NYZ I, vol. 19, pp. 8-17.

2.7 The 1920s

In September 1922, when Nogami was thirty-seven, she published "Kaijin-maru" in the magazine *Chūō kōron*.⁷⁰ "Kaijin-maru" was based on a real story that Nogami had heard in Usuki from the skipper of a little schooner. Apart from the facts that the boat was in distress, that the skipper's nephew was murdered and that the remaining crew members believed that they were rescued by the deity Konpira, who appeared in their dream (in the dream Konpira said to the skipper that they would be rescued the following day, and in fact they were rescued on that day), everything in the story came from her imagination. "Kaijin-maru" used the issue of cannibalism to explore how extreme circumstances, such as the starvation facing the crew members before their rescue, can lead to extreme behaviour. The positive response from the readers of "Kaijin-maru" secured Nogami's status as an established author.

Another small but important work demonstrating Nogami's progress in psychological understanding is "Ōishi Yoshitomo",⁷¹ published in 1925. This story is based on a well known demonstration of samurai loyalty, the Forty-Seven Rōnin Incident of 1703, and on the man who led the revenge of the forty-seven rōnin. The great short-story writer Akutagawa Ryūnosuke (1892-1927) had written about the same figure ten years before Nogami, depicting him as a loyal and strong hero undergoing a mental struggle. Nogami seemed determined to write the story from a new perspective. She portrayed Ōishi Yoshitomo as a weak-minded man who was pushed to the heroic act by the financial distress of the rōnin group and the pressure of his wife's expectations.

Nogami also published a travel account, "Michinoku no tabi"⁷² and a play, "Kusareketa ie",⁷³ in January and May 1927 respectively. Nogami in fact wrote several plays, mainly between 1915 and 1927. The titles of these plays reveal the influence of Noh. Among the nine plays she wrote, three are based on Noh plays: *Fujito* (1920), *Kantan* (1920) and *Ayanotsuzumi* (1922).⁷⁴ The remaining plays show Nogami's

⁷⁰ NYZ I, vol. 4, pp. 311-377.

⁷¹ NYZ I, vol. 6, pp. 3-80. Many read the Chinese character as "Yoshio" instead of "Yoshitomo", but Nogami claimed this reading was incorrect. NYZ I, vol. 6, p. 81.

⁷² NYZ I, vol. 15, pp. 3-70.

⁷³ NYZ I, vol. 14, pp. 353-436.

⁷⁴ NYZ I, vol. 14, pp. 137-150, 151-240, 273-300, respectively.

knowledge in wide areas, such as the Bible and Greek mythology, and indicate her interests in human tragedy (*Himitsu*, 1916)⁷⁵, women's issues (*Ningen sōzō* and *Reikon no akanbō*, 1918),⁷⁶ and social issues (*Shibarareta mono*, 1924⁷⁷ and *Kusarekaketa ie*, 1927).

The last play, *Kusarekaketa ie*, shows Nogami's increasing interest in social and political issues. Visiting an old friend's home somewhere in Michinoku (northern Honshu, including Fukushima, Miyagi, Iwate and Aomori prefectures), she was shocked by the situation of the once rich landed family, which was now in economic decline. "Kusarekaketa ie" was a result of this visit. This work grew into the novel *Machiko*,⁷⁸ published from August 1928 to December 1930 mainly in the literary magazine *Kaizō*.

Machiko concerns the morality of young Japanese Marxists at the time. The main character, a young female sociology student, rejects her middle-class upbringing and tries to elope with a peasant-born activist. Through this story Nogami made clear her opinion that the moral perfection of the individual activist was as important as the ideology itself. She later (in 1951) wrote in her diary after reading Vanda Vasilevskaya's "Love":⁷⁹

It is fair to say that this book shows that agony, sorrow and misery on earth cannot be solved by material goods. *Machiko* suggested the same thing. It is an irony that this book [Love] received the Stalin Prize.⁸⁰

Nogami seemed satisfied with the fact that in *Machiko* she did her best to deal with very complex issues, although she was never satisfied with the work itself. After completing the next to last chapter, she wrote in her diary entry of 25 March 1930: "... I can't write better than this. This [judgement] is not pessimism. I also know that there is no one else who can write better than I did on this theme".⁸¹

⁷⁵ NYZ I, vol. 14, pp. 13-47.

⁷⁶ NYZ I, vol. 14, pp. 49-61, 63-135, respectively.

⁷⁷ NYZ I, vol. 14, pp. 301-351.

⁷⁸ NYZ I, vol. 7.

⁷⁹ Vanda Vasilevskaya (1905-64): a Russian writer. (Born in Poland, she became a naturalised Russian in 1939.)

⁸⁰ Diary entry of 3 March 1951, NYZ II, vol. 11, p. 29.

⁸¹ NYZ II, vol. 3, p. 27.

The magazine *Kaizō*, in which Nogami had published *Machiko*, suddenly rejected the last chapter, which was then published in the magazine *Chūō kōron*. The reason for *Kaizō*'s rejection is not clear. The publishers told Nogami that, although they did not doubt the quality of the novel, *Machiko* had become too long. However, I do not find this convincing, because only one more issue of the magazine was needed to complete the novel's publication. Nogami gave expression to her feeling of strong vexation in her diary.⁸² We can surmise from the political situation in Japan at that time that Nogami's sympathetic description of Marxism and of its activists could well have been the reason for *Kaizō*'s decision.

2.8 Between 1930 and the end of the Second World War

Japan invaded China in the early 1930s. This later became the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945), the fourth war involving Japan in Nogami's lifetime. Her attitude towards war was clear from the beginning of this war, although she confined her expression of it to her private diaries, especially from the late 1930s. Her diary entry of 22 May 1932 reads:

The political activities of the military authorities are at the top of the list of distressing events in my mind these days. However, the crimes of the politicians who allow them to behave like that are also deep.⁸³

A letter written in 1937 to her first son Soichi in Italy says: "... the fear I had which made me send you abroad has appeared as a reality and is surrounding us ... I cannot condone war in any way".⁸⁴

In the first half of the 1930s, however, Nogami could continue her work, despite the fact that she anticipated that a period of forced silence might come. In December 1932, Nogami published "Wakai musuko".⁸⁵ This portrays a philosophical young student who is involved with the leftist movement of the time and is searching for the proper way to live. Since this figure is the germ of the main character in *Meiro*, I will discuss him in chapter 3.

⁸² Diary entry of 3 October 1930, *NYZ II*, vol. 3, p. 127-128.

⁸³ *NYZ II*, vol. 3, p. 479.

⁸⁴ Letter 219, *NYZ II*, vol. 24, p. 302.

⁸⁵ *NYZ I*, vol. 6, pp. 83-194.

In 1933 Nogami published the short story "Mebae",⁸⁶ originally "Ojōsan", in which an upper-middle class young girl is mistakenly held at a detention centre as a political offender, charged with harbouring dangerous ideas. At the detention centre she witnesses the cruel way in which political activists are treated. After her release, she never regains her happy innocence and starts to wake up to the oppressive social reality surrounding her. I will also discuss this character in chapter 3, where I discuss the link between *Machiko*, "Wakai musuko", "Mebae" and *Meiro*.

In 1935 Nogami published another story, "Ko-oni no uta - Aru onna no aru toshi no kiroku".⁸⁷ "Ko-oni no uta" stands in contrast to her other works of this period, which show a strong interest in social issues. While "Ko-oni no uta" has a fictional form, it is a roman-à-clef based on the experience of Nogami and her husband. Toyochirō was unintentionally involved in a power struggle at his work place, Hōsei University, from the autumn of 1933. This struggle became a social incident and attracted media attention. Toyochirō was forced to take temporary leave from the university in December of the same year. This trouble continued to bother the couple in the following year. However, it became a fortunate turning point in that it encouraged Toyochirō to take up the study of Noh seriously. "Ko-oni no uta" is a story of family members and others who were involved in the incident. It is quite obvious that Nogami wanted to tell her and Toyochirō's side of the story. It would have been inevitable for the reader at that time to recognise the real personalities involved from the characters in the story, rather than reading it as a purely fictional work.

Later in the same year Nogami wrote "Kanashiki shōnen".⁸⁸ Here she clearly states her thoughts on war. She also criticises the way school education was carried out at that time, especially the military drills. I will discuss this story in the chapter 3, since the main character, a boy, seems to foreshadow the early age of the main character of *Meiro*.

Nogami published "Kuroi gyōretsu" (later the first chapter of *Meiro*)⁸⁹ in November 1936, when she was fifty-one. The main character of this story is Shōzō, an apostate⁹⁰ who disowned his leftist beliefs after a few months in prison. Nogami was

⁸⁶ NYZ I, vol. 6, pp. 235-250.

⁸⁷ NYZ I, vol. 6, pp. 295-362.

⁸⁸ NYZ I, vol. 8, pp. 85-110.

⁸⁹ NYZ I, vol. 9, pp. 3-220.

already thinking of taking this story further when she published it. This is suggested in the postscript, in which she says that the characters in the story would appear to the reader again at appropriate times.⁹¹ The next story, the original "Meiro",⁹² was published twelve months later, in 1937, the year the Sino-Japanese War started. It was very difficult at that time for anyone to criticise the Japanese government, and Nogami felt discouraged from continuing the novel. She braced herself for a period of hardship, realising that she could live according to her conscience only by being silent about Japanese militarism. She wrote in her diary entry of 11 January 1938: "... finally the forced silence has come."⁹³

Nogami's main works between 1938 and the end of the war were accounts of journeys to Europe and America. This journey took place after her husband was firstly offered a scholarship to introduce Japanese culture, particularly Noh, to Europe. Nogami wanted to accompany her husband, but initially there were financial difficulties. These were solved by Iwanami Shoten (a publishing company) deciding to sponsor Nogami. Nogami and her husband left Japan in October 1938. In Italy Nogami saw her son Soichi for the first time in three years. Nogami and Toyoichirō travelled in Europe for a year and visited the United States on the way back to Japan.

Nogami also wrote essays, carefully avoiding censorship, on her friends, her childhood, and on schools she had gone to or things that had happened at her home.⁹⁴ When she wrote about the war in a very short essay, "Tada kodomotachi o",⁹⁵ she only discussed how to protect children during war time. During this period she rewrote Noh stories for children (*O-nō monogatari*),⁹⁶ and translated Bernard Shaw's "Caesar and Cleopatra".⁹⁷ The reason for her silence about the war was obviously that she wished to avoid trouble with the military police. (Despite this, she was once summoned by the

⁹⁰ I will discuss Nogami's use of "apostate" and "apostasy" in the following chapter.

⁹¹ *NYZ I*, vol. 11, p. 505.

⁹² *NYZ I*, vol. 9, pp. 221-419. I call it, following other critics, the original "Meiro", in order to identify the difference between it and the complete novel *Meiro*.

⁹³ *NYZ II*, vol. 5, p. 505.

⁹⁴ "Nara ni sumu tomo e", "Sono koro no omoide" and "Kanariya", *NYZ I*, vol. 19, pp. 460-463, 466-481 and 482-486, respectively.

⁹⁵ *NYZ I*, vol. 19, pp. 464-465.

⁹⁶ *O-nō monogatari* was published in 1943, (Tokyo: Shōgakkān).

⁹⁷ "Shiizaa to Kureopatora" (by Bernard Shaw), *NYZ II*, vol. 20, pp. 475-493.

police in May 1945.)⁹⁸ She was not one of those vocal war critics who were imprisoned and sometimes tortured to death, though she never gave voice to the propaganda of the military government as so many other writers did. It seems as though she was keeping her head down till the storm was gone. This might seem weakness from our present perspective. However, being silent about war was hard enough for an established author in Japan at that time.

Nogami accompanied her husband to Europe and America from October 1938 to November 1939. They were in Paris when the Second World War broke out in Europe. While in England she wrote in her diary entry of 19 March 1939 that it would be wise for Japan not to enter this war, although she doubted whether those in power in Japan would be able to see this. She also thought that even if there were some who would share her view, it would be impossible for them to advocate their opinion against the militarists, who had momentum on their side.⁹⁹ Accounts of her journeys were published between 1939 and 1941 in various magazines and then as the independent volumes *Ōbei no tabi I, II*¹⁰⁰ in 1942 and 1943 respectively.

2.9 After the war

Nogami did not take the original "Meiro" further in the way she had earlier planned. She later said she could not and did not want to do so during the war.¹⁰¹ Further work on the story had to wait until the end of the Second World War. Soon after the war, she started to think of rewriting "Kuroi gyōretsu" and the original "Meiro" as the first and the second chapters of *Meiro*, and published them in October and December 1948, when she was sixty-three. The rest of *Meiro* (chapters 3 to 6) was published in the magazine *Sekai*, between January 1949 and October 1956. The part written solely after the war clearly expresses Nogami's growing interest in schemes of contrasting and/or conflicting ideas. This interest shows the strong influence of her study of philosophy, particularly dialectics, with Tanabe Hajime.

⁹⁸ See *NYZ II*, vol. 9, pp. 48-53. I will discuss this incident in section 3.3.3, "Ambivalence within Nogami".

⁹⁹ *NYZ II*, vol. 6, p. 270.

¹⁰⁰ *NYZ I*, vols. 16 and 17.

¹⁰¹ Diary entry of 21 August 1956, *NYZ II*, vol. 12, p. 475.

While rewriting "Kuroi gyōretsu" and "Meiro", Nogami published a number of short stories: "Satō"¹⁰² and "Kitsune"¹⁰³ in 1946, "Kamisama"¹⁰⁴ and "Kagi - Hen'na mura no hanashi"¹⁰⁵ in 1947. These stories are set between the early 1930s and the year after the end of the war in Kita-Karuizawa (Gunma Prefecture), where Nogami's family had a summer house.¹⁰⁶

When Nogami became a widow in February 1950¹⁰⁷ she was writing the third chapter of *Meiro*. In January of the following year her old friend, the writer Miyamoto Yuriko¹⁰⁸ (1899-1951), died. Nogami wrote three essays about Yuriko in 1951: "Miyamoto Yuriko san", "Miyamoto Yuriko san o omou", "Kojin no omoide".¹⁰⁹ After Yuriko died, Nogami retained her friendship with Yuriko's husband Miyamoto Kenji (the leader of the Japanese Communist Party), even after he remarried. When Kenji was in the high security Abashiri Prison as a political prisoner, Nogami was close to Yuriko and gave her moral support. Nogami sent flowers to Kenji every year on Yuriko's anniversary. Kenji visited Nogami almost every January, discussing Japan's political situation, literature and memories of Yuriko.

It was a memorable day for Nogami when in August 1956 she finally completed *Meiro*. She was seventy-one. She said in her diary:

... I cannot remember how many years have passed since I published the first part (of *Meiro*) as "Kuroi gyōretsu". But since some critics who seemed to have checked my [chronological] record said that it was 20 years ago in some magazine, this must be correct. The unproductive period was caused by the social

¹⁰² NYZ I, vol. 8, pp. 273-297.

¹⁰³ NYZ I, vol. 8, pp. 299-363.

¹⁰⁴ NYZ I, vol. 12, pp. 3-63.

¹⁰⁵ NYZ I, vol. 12, pp. 109-166.

¹⁰⁶ Nogami stayed there for nearly four years from the autumn of 1944, avoiding the bombing of Tokyo, in which her house was destroyed, and the following chaos. See section 2.4, "Marriage".

¹⁰⁷ NYZ II, vol. 10, pp. 307-309.

¹⁰⁸ Miyamoto Yuriko was known as a representative proletarian writer. In 1931 she joined the Japanese Communist Party. She then (in 1932) married Miyamoto Kenji, a party leader, and supported her husband for 12 years while he was in prison. Her works include *Nobuko* (1924-6), *Futari no niwa* (1947) and many others.

¹⁰⁹ NYZ I, vol. 21, pp. 69-71, 72-76 and 77-83, respectively. There are several other essays and interviews concerning Miyamoto Yuriko in NYZ I.

situation before [and during] the Sino-Japanese War. After I came back from abroad, the [Second World] war broke out and I could not keep writing. I did not have the desire [to continue] ... Still I never thought it would become such a big work. The people in this novel led me here ... I can say with confidence that I did my best. (21 August 1956)¹¹⁰

Even after completing *Meiro* Nogami had thoughts of taking the story further. At the end of 1956 she wrote to friends:

If I continue the story [*Meiro*], I will have to research those who actually went to Yan'an¹¹¹ at that time. I would like to see Nosaka¹¹² or his wife sometime in the coming spring. So please help me to organise this. Until now it [the story] has been the main character's escape from a "labyrinth". However, if I continue [the story] after the War, i.e. after the nuclear bomb, it will [have to] be an escape from the "labyrinth" of humankind. (13 December 1956)¹¹³

In March 1957 Nogami saw Nosaka Sanzō, a Communist, who was exiled to the Soviet Union and China during the war. According to her diary, she asked his opinion whether her hero in *Meiro* should be a member of the Communist Party or not. Nosaka's answer was "No". Nogami accepted this advice from a person who knew the difficulties of party life very well.¹¹⁴

In June 1957, Nogami visited China, a country she had longed to see for many years. The details of this one-month trip are in "Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō", "En'an o tazunete", "Atarashiku katsu furui Chūgoku" and "Dōkutsu no machi En'an".¹¹⁵ She also

¹¹⁰ NYZ II, vol. 12, p. 475.

¹¹¹ A Chinese town where the Eighth Route Army was based during the War. *Meiro* ends suggesting the slight possibility that the main character reaches Yan'an to meet the Japanese communist group.

¹¹² Nosaka Sanzō (1892-1993) is known as a leader of the Japanese Communist Party in the Shōwa era. He was arrested and imprisoned in 1928 but soon released, possibly because he renounced his Marxist beliefs. He became a political refugee, going to the Soviet Union in 1929 and then to Yan'an in 1940 where he established Nihon-heishi Hansen Dōmei. He returned to Japan in 1946. His works include "Nihon kyōsan-shugisha e no tegami" (1936), "Minshu-teki Ninon no kensetsu" (1945) and many others. See *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 11, p. 400.

¹¹³ Letter 893, NYZ II, vol. 25, p. 477.

¹¹⁴ Diary entry of 22 March 1957, NYZ II, vol. 13, p. 53. This difficulty of party life and the problems within the Japanese Communist Party seem to be the biggest reasons preventing Nogami from writing the sequel.

¹¹⁵ NYZ I, vol. 15, pp. 161-341, 343-346, 347-350, 351-354, respectively.

wrote a political essay "Seiji e no kaigen"¹¹⁶ in 1946 and an open letter in 1950 to the President of the United States, Harry Truman, "Torūman daitōryō e no kōkaijō"¹¹⁷ in which she asks him not to enter the war in the Korean peninsula. Nogami says a number of times in her diaries, essays and interviews that a writer cannot be free from politics.

2.10 1960s and after

Hideyoshi to Rikyū was begun early in 1959.¹¹⁸ It was published in the magazine *Chūō kōron* between January 1962 and September 1963, and appeared as an independent volume in 1964. Karaki Junzō's *Sen no Rikyū* had inspired Nogami's literary imagination. In a letter to her friend she said: "... [I] stole [the theme] from Karaki's *Sen no Rikyū*, because his *Rikyū* is wonderfully written. I want to take this theme and make it a novel".¹¹⁹ I will discuss *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* in chapter 4.

In August 1966 Nogami started concrete preparation for the novel *Mori*,¹²⁰ which she had been planning for many years.¹²¹ She started to write in June the following year. She says in her diary entry of 23 June 1967:

"I have started 'Mori no gakkō' ... I don't know how it will turn out nor how long I can continue. Anyway the curtain has been raised. There is a road in front of me. There is no other way to live but to continue to walk."¹²²

By the time *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* was published in 1963, Nogami was seventy-eight. She was eighty-two when she started *Mori*. The latter is an autobiographical novel. It portrays her life in the Meiji Girls School, which she attended as a student for six years from 1900. She did not complete it, although it was almost finished when she died in March 1985. Besides her attention to detail and constant rewriting, her poor eyesight (due to a cataract) and the consequent eye operation were the reasons why *Mori* took so long. She never regretted postponing writing *Mori* until the end of her life. She

¹¹⁶ NYZ I, vol. 20, pp. 158-167.

¹¹⁷ NYZ I, vol. 21, pp. 26-42.

¹¹⁸ Diary entry of 29 March 1959, NYZ II, vol. 13, p. 442.

¹¹⁹ Letter 965, NYZ II, vol. 25, p. 543.

¹²⁰ Diary entry of 4 August 1966, NYZ II, vol. 15, p. 406.

¹²¹ NYZ II, vol. 16, p. 131.

¹²² NYZ II, vol. 16, p. 131.

wrote several times in her diary that the time she chose was the best time to write about her school life.

2.11 Nogami's study of philosophy

Nogami studied philosophy with Tanabe Hajime (1885-1962) between 1951 and 1961, ceasing only when Tanabe became very ill. Tanabe was a well-respected philosopher. He started as a disciple of Nishida Kitarō (1870-1945), later separating from Nishida.¹²³ It was while studying with Tanabe, that Nogami wrote the latter part of *Meiro*, then planned *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, and completed the first quarter of the novel.¹²⁴ The influence of the study of philosophy is evident in both novels and in essays such as "Nō-men kanwa", on Noh masks.¹²⁵ Nogami continued to read philosophy after Tanabe died.¹²⁶

Nogami's study took place at Tanabe's home in Kita-Karuizawa twice a week.¹²⁷ At that time she stayed in Kita-Karuizawa for around six months every year, from May to November. While she was in Tokyo she and Tanabe wrote to each other, although no letters have been published. Their friendship seems to have become more intense around 1953. At the end of this year she wrote in her diary:

This year was a memorable one for me in various ways. I never thought before it could be possible to have a relationship like this, deep in intelligence and love. It is very rare at our age.¹²⁸ Therefore we have to keep this relationship treasured and pure.¹²⁹

This love affair with Tanabe seems to have played an influential part in Nogami's life as an author. Her diaries show that Nogami treasured Tanabe's opinion and thought in various areas.¹³⁰ Many readers and some critics have wondered how Nogami could

¹²³ Some of his well-known works are *Zangedō toshite no tetsugaku* (1946), *Jitsuzon to ai to jissen* (1947), and *Kirisutokyō no benshō* (1948).

¹²⁴ Letter 965, *NYZ II*, vol. 25, p. 543, and Diary entry of 13 June 1958, *NYZ II*, vol. 13, p. 309.

¹²⁵ *NYZ I*, vol. 22, pp. 149-153.

¹²⁶ *NYZ II*, vol. 14, pp. 390, 646.

¹²⁷ *NYZ I*, vol. 22, p. 328.

¹²⁸ Both were sixty-eight.

¹²⁹ Diary entry of 31 December 1953, *NYZ II*, vol. 11, p. 562.

¹³⁰ Nogami took part in the demonstration in Tokyo against the revision of the Japan-U.S. Security

express young people's life and feeling, love in particular, so freshly and vividly in her old age. In my view, Nogami was a person who never became old in her intellectual capacity nor ever lost interest and curiosity in human beings. Her capacity to empathise with young people demonstrates this, as does her love for Tanabe. She considered the encounter with Tanabe in her sixties to be as important as the encounter with Natsume Sōseki at the beginning of her career.

2.12 The influence of Noh

Noh played a great role in Nogami's work. Her husband, a well-known authority on Noh, introduced her to it. While Toyochirō was alive they often went together to Noh performances, and even after Nogami became a widow, she kept a close relationship with Noh and the Noh world, and especially with Shimogakari Hōshō, a lineage of *waki* actors. Nogami believed Noh was the most beautiful and perfected masked theatre art on earth and was very proud of the fact that her native country had produced it. She made free use of her abundant knowledge of Noh in her works, especially in *Meiro*. She also wrote story lines and simple explanations for performances sponsored by the Shimogakari Hōshō group.¹³¹

2.13 Nogami as a diligent writer

It is amazing that Nogami Yaeko kept writing so diligently throughout her life. In her diaries we can see her attitude towards writing. She rewrote her works again and again until she felt further improvement was beyond her. When working on *Meiro*, she wrote in her diary on 25 June 1948:

... an important addition occurred in my mind. Though I've been writing so carefully and thoroughly, there can be an oversight. So it is impossible to write a good story just overnight.¹³²

Treaty in May 1960. There is evidence that Tanabe, although he did not participate in the demonstration, supported this protest strongly. See Ienaga Saburō, *Tanabe Hajime no shisō-shi-teki kenkyū* (Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1974), pp. 298-299.

¹³¹ NYZ II, vol. 29, pp. 110-161.

¹³² NYZ II, vol. 10, p. 102.

Doing her best was always in her mind. She said in a 1975 interview that the writer's work becomes valuable only when it reaches the status of a 'work of art' in which the writer addresses universal themes.¹³³ She also says:

[After completing a section of *Meiro* in September 1948] I can't do this any better. I did my best. I'll let others criticise this work if they want. Once born baby can't be put back to the womb. There may be defects [if you look for them]. However, I have created what nobody can write or at least no one else has written. (23 September 1948)¹³⁴

[After finishing another section of *Meiro* in May 1951] In the beginning [I could write only with] painful slowness, just one or two pages a day ... I did my best. Describing this work as good or bad is the same as describing a child to whom you gave birth pretty or not pretty. (28 May 1951)¹³⁵

When she was seventy-two she said: "As long as I live, I would like to live better and to do better work".¹³⁶ In June 1980, when she was ninety-five, Nogami wrote to the head of the Iwanami Shoten publishing company about her collected works, which were soon to be published:

Even if a series of fine collected works [of mine] were published, they would be things that once "existed" [in the past]. In order to maintain my status as an active ninety-five year old writer, I have to be a [currently] "existing" one. Therefore I have to go back to *Mori*.¹³⁷

She said that this attitude came from Natsume Sōseki. After he died many of his disciples left the writer's life. She felt a sense of pride that she was the only one who had followed Sōseki as a writer.¹³⁸ She spent a long time rewriting everything she wrote, trying to press the object close and see into it. This attitude sometimes surprised even her. In her diary entry of 4 October 1969 she said: "... only 3 to 4 lines [a day]. Although I'm surprised that I need this long to describe one human face, it is reasonable when you think of a painter's work."¹³⁹

¹³³ "Meiro - Nogami Yaeko san ni kiku", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 252.

¹³⁴ *NYZ II*, vol. 10, p. 148.

¹³⁵ *NYZ II*, vol. 11, p. 68.

¹³⁶ Diary entry of 31 December 1958, *NYZ II*, vol. 13, p. 221.

¹³⁷ Letter 1196, *NYZ II*, vol. 27, pp. 304-305.

¹³⁸ Diary entry of 26 October 1968, *NYZ II*, vol. 16, p. 466.

Another surprise she had was that her stories often went beyond her expectations, especially *Meiro*.¹⁴⁰ She said it was as if "my pen wrote it", or as if some external force were working through her. She believed in this "external force" and relied on it when she had difficulty breaking through intractable parts of a story. She said that she followed her pen.¹⁴¹ At the age of ninety, when writing *Mori*, she wrote: "My pen made me write beyond what I was going to write. This is the joy, wonder and distress of writing".¹⁴² About a year before she died she wrote to a friend: "Writing a novel is dealing with a living being. The pen makes an author go into places which she had never thought of. I'm sick of this because I think it is going to be like this till I die".¹⁴³ This indicates her rare talent, resourcefulness and passion to write, which never left her. It seems that the longer she lived the more interest she had in human affairs.

2.14 Towards the end of her life

Nogami did not have good eyesight. Towards the end of her life it became very bad. She had to reduce reading, watching TV and anything else which required the use of her eyes, so that she could save her sight for writing. She continued writing in a half blind condition for a while. She finally had an eye operation in November 1982, when she was ninety-seven.¹⁴⁴ The operation was successful. She wrote a letter to another writer, Ōoka Shōhei (1909-1988), who had great respect for Nogami,¹⁴⁵ on 7 December 1982. In the letter she expresses excitement at regaining her sight:

The operation seems to be a real success. Space is no longer what it was before. The brilliant brightness, a beautiful mixture of silver and gold in the basic purple tone, gives me a thought that the world, right after God created it, might have been like this.¹⁴⁶

¹³⁹ *NYZ II*, vol. 16, p. 729.

¹⁴⁰ See *NYZ II*, vol. 10, pp. 298-299, 370, vol. 11, pp. 462-463, vol. 12, p. 183, vol. 13, p. 638 and *passim*.

¹⁴¹ Diary entry of 18 January 1968, *NYZ II*, vol. 16, p. 272.

¹⁴² Diary entry of 18 July 1975, *NYZ II*, vol. 17(2), p. 462.

¹⁴³ Letter 2207, *NYZ II*, vol. 27, p. 443.

¹⁴⁴ *NYZ II*, vol. 17(3), p. 637.

¹⁴⁵ Ōe Kenzaburō, "Hontō ni chiteki na ikikata".

¹⁴⁶ Letter 2148, *NYZ II*, vol. 27, p. 400.

She lived another two and a half years after the operation, and kept working until just before she died at the end of March 1985. This was only five weeks before her 100th birthday. Her diary ends on 13th March 1985. The last diary entry shows one of the characteristics of her entire diary, which had been kept for sixty-two years: difficult matters such as politics or philosophy and matters in her daily life are treated next to each other. The following is the content:

The garden is completely covered by white [snow]. But the red blossoms of the plum tree at Soichi's window are still fine. Soviet Russia - can the advent of Gorbachev build a better world?

The Kiuchis in Tomono sent me various hand-made sweets instead of their annual mochi [rice cakes]. It is very kind of them. I'd better send them something like chirimen-iriko [a tiny Japanese dried fish] in return.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁷ NYZ II, vol. 17(3), p. 745.

Chapter 3 *Meiro*

3.1 Introduction

Meiro is the longest novel that Nogami Yaeko wrote, comprising three volumes of *Nogami Yaeko zenshū I*. The story is set between 1935 and 1945, the time when Japanese fascism reached its summit and then collapsed. *Meiro* took twenty years to complete.

In this chapter I would like first to discuss the background of the novel, both factual matters such as the political, social and historical situations in which *Meiro* was written and which stimulated Nogami's literary imagination and her philosophical sense, and the development of the author's thought up to the time she started to write the novel. Secondly, I would like to look at various characters and examine the patterns of contrast and conflict in the story, and the influence on Nogami of her study of philosophy.

3.1.1 The political and social situation in Japan prior to 1930

Since the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan had tried desperately to strengthen its economic and military power, because the forced ending of national isolation unsettled, even frightened the Japanese. It became clear to Japan that there were many countries which could overpower it militarily. In 1885, the year Nogami was born, Mori Arinori (1847-1889) became the first Minister of Education and established a nationalistic education system which basically lasted until the end of the Second World War. The practice of nationalistic education and Japanese militarism grew together and fed on each other. The government issued the peace regulations (*Hoan jōrei*) in 1887, the Meiji Constitution (the Constitution of Great Imperial Japan) in 1889¹ and the Imperial Rescript on Education, which emphasised loyalty and filial piety in 1890. By the time Nogami seriously set herself to write in 1906, Japan had already experienced two wars against

¹ Nogami claimed in 1981, when she was ninety-six, that her earliest memory was of the year of the Meiji Constitution. She said in the interview "Omoide no naka no hitobito" that it was when she was about four years old and she saw many people walking in the street as if they were participating in a demonstration. It was a celebration of the issuing of the Meiji Constitution. See *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 410.

foreign countries (China in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895 and Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905), and had emerged victorious in both.

During the thirty years between the start of the nationalistic education system and the beginning of the First World War, Japan built a nation which had the Emperor as the unifying idea, the military as a political means in foreign policy, a strong government bureaucracy, and an economy based on poor farmers and poorly-paid wage labourers. The low-wage policy placed constraints on the size of the domestic market, which led in turn to a search for markets abroad. The success of the wars against China and Russia invited the idea that Japan could secure overseas markets by military means.

There were, of course, some criticisms of these policies within Japan. "Jisei no kansatsu"² (1896) by the Christian leader, essayist and editor, Uchimura Kanzō (1861-1930) was one of them.³ In 1891, when Uchimura was teaching at a public high school, he refused to worship the symbol (the signature) of the Emperor in the Imperial Rescript on Education and was forced to resign. Uchimura wrote many pacifist essays in the 1900s. Nogami came across Uchimura when she was a student at Meiji Jogakkō; Uchimura spoke at the school, and some of the students attended the Sunday meetings of his *Mukyōkai*⁴ (non-church) group. Whenever Nogami talked or wrote about Uchimura later in life, she showed great respect for him. Other criticisms of the militaristic foreign policy came from the poet Yosano Akiko, one of the main members of Seitōsha;⁵ from the great novelist Natsume Sōseki, who introduced western individualism as a counterweight to patriotic nationalism; and from the socialist Kōtoku Shūsui (1871-1911).⁶ But over time this criticism diminished while militaristic attitudes grew rapidly in strength.

² A satire that lampooned Japanese optimism following the Sino-Japanese War.

³ Uchimura was the founder of a 'non-church' Christianity sect and of the magazine *Seisho no kenkyū*. His well-known works are *Kirisuto shinto no nagusame*, *Kyūanroku* and *Yo wa ikani shite kirisuto-shinto to narishi ka*. "Uchimura Kanzō" and "Uchimura Kanzō fukei-jiken", *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 2, pp. 122-123.

⁴ See Mori, Chapter 12, pp. 419-434, the essays "Shishin", *NYZ I*, vol. 18, pp. 22-28 and "Watashi ga jogakusei jidai ni mita Uchimura san", *NYZ I*, vol. 21, pp. 421-424, the interview "Furusato no rekishi to ai", *NYZ II*, vol. 29, pp. 443-444, and "Uchimura Kanzō", *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 2, pp. 122.

⁵ See above, section 2.5, "Seitōsha". Yosano's famous anti-war poem is *Kimi shinitamō koto nakare*.

⁶ Katō Shūichi, "Nihonjin no sekai-zō", *Kindai nihon shisō-shi VIII*, (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1961), p. 231. I have consulted "Nihon-jin no sekai-zō" extensively in writing this section.

In 1920, after the First World War, there was some optimism in Europe generated by the establishment of the League of Nations and the movement to reduce armaments. In Japan, Marxism and the proletarian literary movement emerged as new opponents of Japanese militarism and gained momentum. This period was called the "Taishō democracy".⁷ However, the Japanese government introduced the Maintenance of the Public Order Act in 1925 and the special secret police in 1928. By the end of the 1920s the Japanese government was ready to take actions of massive oppression against not only Marxism and the proletarian literary movement, but also more broadly against freedom of expression and association.

3.1.2 Why *Meiro* took twenty years to complete

The principal reason why *Meiro* took twenty years to complete relates to Nogami's reaction to the political and social situation in Japan, more precisely to Japanese fascism.

Although the term "Japanese fascism" is widely used to refer to the totalitarian character of Japan during the period 1931 to 1945, Japanese fascism was different from its European counterpart in important respects. For example, the Nazi leaders were for the most part from the lower social class and without higher education, while Japanese leaders were university graduates from the upper class. The Nazis did not hide their sheer aggressiveness from themselves. Just before their invasion of Poland in August 1939, Hitler said that the important thing in order to begin and carry out a war was not justice but victory, and on another occasion Himmler said that his only interest in other nations was as slaves to German culture. The Japanese leaders, by contrast, convinced themselves that their invasion was a holy war to protect Asians from Europeans and spread the light of imperial justice. Unlike its European counterpart, Japanese fascism did not include anti-semitism; nor did it countenance the massacre or mass exile of political opponents, although it certainly countenanced racism and therefore the appalling treatment of prisoners of war and civilians of occupied countries.

There were similarities, however, which justify the use of the term fascism for the Japanese phenomenon. These include an emphasis on nationalism, denial of individual

⁷ The Taishō era lasted from 1912 to 1926.

freedom in the form of civil liberties, suppression of socialism and communism, and expansionism abroad. Other similarities are its hysteria and the resulting destruction and chaos.⁸ In this thesis, I refer to both Japanese fascism and Japanese militarism, but their meanings are very similar.

In the early 1930s, when Nogami was working over in her mind the idea of "Kuroi gyōretsu", which later became the first chapter of *Meiro*, the fascists were gaining power in Germany, Italy and Japan. The "black lines" ("Kuroi gyōretsu") of fascists were gradually surrounding the world. In Japan there was the 5.15 (May the 15th) Incident⁹ in 1932, in which Prime Minister Inukai was assassinated by naval officers. There is a record of this incident in Nogami's diary, where she attributed responsibility not only to the military but also to the politicians.¹⁰ "Kuroi gyōretsu" was first published in November 1936,¹¹ when Japan was about to go to war against China. Prior to that the Japanese military authorities had in 1919 set up the Guan Dong Army in Manchuria, later to become the launching pad of the invasion of China, to protect Japanese interests in the area. Manchuria was invaded in 1931 (the Manchuria Incident) and a major battle with China provoked in 1932 (the Shanghai Incident). These incidents led to the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945), which was initiated by the Japanese military with the so-called Lu Gou Qiao Incident¹² in July 1937. The original "Meiro", which later became the second chapter of *Meiro*, was published in the same year.

In Europe at the same time, there were many incidents caused by the Nazis and the Italian fascists which caught Nogami's attention. For example, in her diary entry of 16 May 1933, she worried about the oppression of Jewish academics and the removal of their books from libraries. She described this as a "reckless act", worse than the barbarism of Shi Huangdi of Qin.¹³ In Nogami's diary entry of 27 July 1934, there is a

⁸ See Noel O'Sullivan, *Fascism*, (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd. 1983), pp. 60-71, Maruyama Masao, "Gunkoku shihaisha no seishin-keitai", *Chōryū* (Tokyo: 1949); cited in Hidaka Rokurō, ed., *Sengo Nihon Shisō Taikei 1, Sengo shisō no shuppatsu* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1968), pp. 187-222 and Nakamura Kikuo, "Tennō-sei fashizumu-ron yori", *Tennō-sei fashizumu-ron* (Tokyo: Hara Shobō, 1967); cited in Yoshimoto Takaaki, ed., *Sengo Nihon Shisō Taikei 5, Kokka no shisō* (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969), pp. 224-249.

⁹ The civilian cabinet was abolished by this incident and a military cabinet took over.

¹⁰ Diary entry of 22 May 1932, *NYZ II*, vol. 3, p. 479.

¹¹ *Chūō kōron*, 51:11.

¹² Also known as the Marco Polo Bridge Incident.

record of the assassination of the Austrian Prime Minister Dollfuss during a putsch by the Nazis, and Nogami expresses serious concern about the danger of a Second European War.¹⁴

Nogami was worried about left-wing Japanese writers, her friend Miyamoto Yuriko in particular, with whom she shared political ideas and who were subject to police surveillance. Their works were called "Proletarian Literature". The proletarian literary movement started as a socialist literary movement at the beginning of the 1900s and reached its peak between 1928 and 1931. Proletarian literature meant not only literature for the working class, but also socialist and communist literature based on a Marxist view of the class struggle in capitalist society. Nogami was not in the centre of this movement, as was her friend Miyamoto Yuriko,¹⁵ but she was sympathetic to its goals and aspirations. In February 1933, Kobayashi Takiji (1903-1933), one of the main writers in the proletarian literature movement, was murdered at a police station in Tokyo. This murder was widely seen as a symbol of the oppression of leftists by the government. The movement collapsed soon after and many of the leftist writers and others associated with the movement were forced to renounce their beliefs through torture and imprisonment. In March 1933, the Japanese government decided to quit the League of Nations. Its withdrawal became official in 1935, the same year in which Minobe Tatsukichi (1873-1948), a constitutional and administrative law scholar, who advocated so-called *Tennō kikan setsu* (the emperor-as-an-instrument of state theory)¹⁶ as well as civilian cabinets and the expansion of civil liberties, was harassed by the military and right-wing gangster organisations. He lost his position in the House of Peers, and some of his works were withdrawn from publication.¹⁷ Nogami developed a deep anger against this kind of violence.¹⁸

¹³ The first emperor of China, who united China in BC 221. Shi Huangdi went on many foreign expeditions and is known by his tyranny and barbaric acts, including the burning of books. *NYZ II*, vol. 4, p. 78.

¹⁴ *NYZ II*, vol. 4, p. 374.

¹⁵ See above, section 2.9, "After the war".

¹⁶ Also known as *Kokka hōjin setsu*. With this theory Minobe claimed that (i) sovereign power belongs to the nation, not the emperor, and (ii) the emperor is the highest instrument of the nation.

¹⁷ "Tennō kikan setsu mondai", *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 9, pp. 1004-1006.

¹⁸ Diary entry of 23 March 1935, *NYZ II*, vol. 4, p. 485.

On the 26th of February 1936, the so-called 2.26 Incident happened. It was an unsuccessful coup attempt by a group of army officers, members of the sect of the Imperial Way (*Kōdō-ha*). They attacked the Prime Minister's residence, the Diet, the National Police Agency and several other government buildings, and assassinated several ministers. Nogami noted the details of the incident in her diary¹⁹ and used what she actually heard and saw of this event at the beginning of the original "Meiro". This story begins on the morning of this day. While she seems not to have followed this incident in every detail,²⁰ it had a great impact on her as well as on the rest of the nation.

It is clear from Nogami's diary that she was consistently critical of Japanese militarism, beginning with the invasion of Korea in 1910 through to the end of the Second World War. However, she was publicly silent. Despite saying in the postscript of "Kuroi gyōretsu" (in 1936) that the story would continue,²¹ she could not or did not touch *Meiro* at all after the original "Meiro" was published and until the end of the Second World War. As mentioned in chapter 2, Nogami spent this time at her summer house in Kita-Karuizawa writing accounts of journeys and short essays, trying not to attract the attention of the military government. By the time she resumed *Meiro*, which started with her rewriting "Kuroi gyōretsu" and the original "Meiro" as the first and the second chapters of the novel, ten years had passed²² since the publication of the original "Meiro". When she published the rewritten versions in 1948, she said in the preface:

It has been already more than ten years since I deserted the people in this novel on my desk. This was not because I was lazy. [It was because] the political situation in Japan did not allow the characters to act freely; in other words, it did not allow me to describe them honestly as they would have been. If I had compromised with the direction of Japan represented by the military during this time, I could have completed this novel much earlier. However, I could not do it.

¹⁹ Diary entries from 26 February to 2 March 1936, *NYZ II*, vol. 5, pp. 35-45.

²⁰ There are mistakes in the description of the 2.26 Incident in the novel. Nogami wrote that two military officers committed suicide, although actually one committed suicide and the other tried but failed and was executed later. In the story fifteen military officers were executed, although in fact there were two civilians among the fifteen. These mistakes were identified and criticised by a contemporary Japanese novelist and literary critic, Kaga Otohiko, as an elementary error. Kaga, "Ai to sensō no kōzu - *Meiro*", *Bungei tenbō*, 5, p. 233.

²¹ Section 2.8, "Between 1930 and the end of the Second World War".

²² Diary entry of 17 June 1947, *NYZ II*, vol. 9, p. 483.

Our pens are not chained any longer, thanks to the liberation which was given by defeat in the war. Now, I am able to let these people [in the novel] continue their interrupted lives in the way they want.²³

Nogami also said in the preface that when writing the version published before the war she had proceeded cautiously, as if she were avoiding mines. She was forced into evasions and omissions which would not be necessary after the war.

As a matter of fact, there are not major differences between the old and new versions of *Meiro* in either theme or story structure. The only added section (the fourth in the first chapter) is "Chiisai Kao", which is needed for the development of the story. Nogami's sympathy with the young idealistic leftists of the time and their anti-war attitudes is already clear in the old version, and it is precisely why she felt she could not continue to write during the war. Even writing privately was not safe, because even a next door neighbour could be a police informer.²⁴

Nogami finished rewriting the first and second chapters of *Meiro* in May 1948, beginning the third chapter in the following month.²⁵ The publication of the new work started in the magazine *Sekai* in January 1949. While writing the third chapter, Nogami realised that her novel would expand far beyond her expectation. Together with her uncompromising diligence towards writing, this expansion, a development that Nogami herself did not initially foresee, was another reason why the novel took so long to complete. She finished the final chapter in August 1956. This was a memorable day for her.²⁶ She dedicated *Meiro* to her deceased husband Toyoichirō, who had died in 1950.

²³ NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 506.

²⁴ So-called 'neighbourhood associations' were developing in Japan. On 11 September 1940, the Home Ministry issued Order No. 17, "Essentials of Providing for Community Councils" in order to prepare everybody for the war. This order emphasises the importance of people's moral training and spiritual unity based on the spirit of neighbourhood solidarity. This left virtually no room for individual freedom of thought and expression. See Thomas Havens, the section "Bringing The War Home", *Valley Of Darkness: The Japanese People and World War Two* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1978), pp. 72-89.

²⁵ NYZ II, vol. 10, pp. 89-93.

²⁶ Section 2.9, "After the war", including the quotation of the diary entry of 21 August 1956.

3.1.3 Important characters prefigured in previous works

I have emphasised that Nogami was a diligent writer. In fact, there is a clear trace of her study and consequent progress in each work. The reader often sees that her ideas in a particular work are later developed in another, or that her ideas in certain stories merge into another story in more mature forms. In the case of *Meiro*, embryonic forms of major characters are to be found in her previous stories.

As mentioned in the Introduction, a contemporary Japanese novelist, Kaga Otohiko (born 1929), an admirer of Dostoyevsky, claims that *Meiro* has a unified, underlying philosophy, which one can see either by reading one section or the entire story.²⁷ One of the distinguishing features of *Meiro* is that every character, major or minor, is described in great detail, giving the reader a vivid and multifaceted picture of a concrete individual. No detail is irrelevant. This detailed characterisation is one of the strengths of Nogami's novels, ensuring that her work will continue to be of value even if some of the themes become old-fashioned. Although *Meiro* does have a central character in the young leftist Shōzō, he is not the only one who receives her careful attention. As some critics point out, several characters in *Meiro* are given key roles of equal importance.

Nogami's diary entry of 13 May 1936, when she was germinating "Kuroi gyōretsu", shows that she had two of her previous works in mind: *Machiko* (1928-1930) and "Wakai musuko" (1932).²⁸ At that time she did not expect the story to expand to such length and she was thinking of only two main characters, Shōzō and a bright and beautiful young woman with a personality contrasting with that of Shōzō. These two characters indeed play important roles. Others, who appear in the parts written after the war and give extra depth and dimension to the novel, were not born in the story yet.

Nogami published *Machiko*, her first novel, in the magazine *Kaizō* from August 1928 to May 1930. The last section was published in *Chūō kōron* in December 1930. It is the story of a young sociology student, Machiko, who struggles to establish her subjecthood, identity, individuality and independence against traditionalist conventions (such as that a good woman should marry in her early twenties) and against a background of Marxist activism, then a powerful ideology among Japanese intellectuals. In

²⁷ Kaga, "Ai to sensō no kōzu - *Meiro*", *Bungei tenbō*, 5, p. 223.

²⁸ *NYZ II*, vol. 5, p. 84.

terms of the theme of establishing one's own subjecthood, *Machiko* is a further development of "Ōishi Yoshitomo", a short story which Nogami published in 1926.²⁹

Machiko's mother is worried about her daughter getting too old to find a good husband, but the daughter feels sharply that something is wrong in a society which has such a huge discrepancy between rich and poor. She does not feel at home in the social class to which she belongs and searches for new ground on which to establish her identity.

There is a contrast between Machiko and her mother, with the former representing freedom as self-realisation, the latter tradition. Marxism was gaining strength in Japan when *Machiko* was written, especially among young intellectuals. Nogami does not question Marxism itself in this novel. It is clear that, at least at that time, she thought of Marxism as a necessary ideology to address the 'contradictions' of capitalism, although she saw there were strained interpretations and faulty reasoning in Marxism.³⁰ Like many intellectuals, Nogami was attracted to Marxism as a critique of capitalism, although she was never an activist, nor was she categorised as a leftist writer. In *Machiko*, Nogami shows her basic approach to life: critical scepticism. Through Machiko's experience, Nogami expresses her view of Marxist activists. At the mid-point in the story Machiko is about to convert to Marxism, but she regains her own judgement and independence as soon as she finds dishonesty and indifference to other people's sorrow in a male activist with whom she was going to elope. In *Machiko*, Nogami questions the morality of Marxists, who are supposed to practice a universalist ideology.

Machiko, who finally gains independence both from conventional ties and from the mirage pursued by Marxist activists, becomes Tazue, one of the important secondary characters in *Meiro*. Nogami describes Tazue as a young, intelligent, sharp but conceited realist. In the first chapter of *Meiro* she writes:

At around the time when [Tazue] learned to look down on teachers at secondary school, she had contempt for her mother at home. Respect for her father, which lasted longer than for her mother, disappeared without a trace when she detected that he had had a hidden mistress two years earlier. Even when the flood of leftist thought, which had its watershed at around Shōwa 6-7 [1931-1932], drowned young intellectuals in this country, she passed through it, like a wild duck,

²⁹ Section 2.7, "The 1920s".

³⁰ Diary entry of 17 October 1927, *NYZ II*, vol. 2, p. 174.

without getting wet. One of the reasons was that the strength of the flood was weakened by the time she attended a girl's university. When the swirls, which had had in their current something that was spiritual even though originally it was strictly materialistic, dispersed and vanished from the surface, she, like many others, picked up bits of flotsam that the current had been about to wash away. She became emboldened and selfish. She had no dream, no fantasy and was without an object of worship. God or Buddha (*shin-butsu*), which made people kneel down when Tazue's mother was young, even though it was without substance and had only the outline of the halo, was already an old-fashioned and ordinary abstract noun for Tazue. In short, she became fearless. ("Tazue", Chapter 1)³¹

In the two years following the completion of *Machiko* (1930), Japan experienced a number of upheavals. Economically, the country was facing a depression, which began after the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923 and which deepened with the world depression after 1929. Unemployment was high and Japan sought to expand markets abroad by invading China. The Manchuria Incident further strengthened the power of the Japanese military. In May 1932, the 5.15 Incident occurred and with it the end of the party cabinets. From then to the end of the Second World War, executive government was in the hands of military personnel and bureaucrats. Nogami describes some of these bureaucrats in *Meiro* as shameless egoists. In parallel with rising militarism, the proletarian movement reached its peak in 1931, despite systematic arrests by the government, which started in 1928. The oppression of communists became even more severe in March 1932, and many activist went underground. In this social and political atmosphere, Nogami published "Wakai musuko".

Keiji, the central character of "Wakai musuko" (1932), is the prototype of Shōzō, the main character in *Meiro*. A philosophical senior high school student, he explains himself to a leftist friend who invites him to a reading group:

I am one who has a weak point common among people who are between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. All the leftist logic attracts me as strongly as it does you. However, I have no confidence that I can put it into practice. Even if I could, I would make mistakes by taking a false step, hesitating or going backwards. Sometimes I feel the proletarian movement is wonderful clothing that I

³¹ NYZ I, vol. 9, pp. 51-52.

nonetheless hesitate to wear. I want to act naturally and honestly. That is why I cannot be involved with the Reading Society³² immediately. If you had known before that I'm so indecisive, you wouldn't have tried to persuade me to join.³³

When the school authorities find out that Keiji has attended the secret reading group, many of the members, including Keiji, are arrested. He is soon released because of his good school marks and general good behaviour. However, when he discovers that others, who were in a similar position in the reading group, have been expelled from school, he actively protests against the decision. His mother tries to stop him. At the end of the story, when he is about to go to a protest meeting against his mother's wishes, he says to her: "As I said before, I'm only doing my duty. If I avoid this responsibility, I'll not only be a traitor to my friends, but it may mean the start of a fall into depravity."³⁴ In this story Nogami expressed two kind of contrasts. One is between humanism and militarism, the other between the principle of "justice first" and the attitude of "safety first".

It is important to note a decisive difference in the meaning of "humanism" between western society and Japan. "Humanism" in the West developed in opposition to a god-centred, indeed Christian understanding of human experience. The Japanese *hyūmanizumu*, though imported from the West, developed independently, as did many other imported concepts. *Hyūmanizumu* has nothing to do with God or Christianity. It emphasises the importance of human beings in their own right, rather than in terms of a collectivity or of their relationship to the quasi-divine emperor or to the nation. Nogami understood "humanism" in this typically Japanese way.

Nogami published the short story "Mebae" in July 1933. Kazuko, the main character, is, like Machiko and Keiji, a middle class student. After helping a classmate without knowing the classmate's brother is a left-wing activist, Kazuko unintentionally gets involved in the leftist movement and is arrested as an activist. Even when the misunderstanding is cleared up, she is still suspended from school for three months. During the suspension she reads books and, aided by her experience in the detention centre, becomes aware of a new dimension of reality. She rejects a favour from the headmistress and chooses to fail. Although the setting is different, Kazuko can be seen as a female

³² A student group formed to study socialism.

³³ *NYZ I*, vol. 6, p. 90.

³⁴ *NYZ I*, vol. 6, p. 192.

version of Keiji. The story centres around the contrast between Kazuko as she is before and after her arrest.

Takashi, the young boy in "Kanashiki shōnen" (1935), is the image of Keiji, i.e. of Shōzō in his youth. Takashi is a boy who hates military drills at school and does not understand why Japan is heading towards war. For him, war means a scene which is etched in his mind from a newsreel on the 1914-1918 European war, a field covered endlessly by white grave-posts. As a child, he is sad, angry and confused.

Nogami writes clearly in the postscript to *Meiro* that the characters in the novel have no real-life models. She says that all the characters are aspects of the author herself. In the postscript to the paperback edition Nogami writes:

First of all, the characters in *Meiro* have almost no [real life] models. If you call the characters in my head "models", [I would say that] they are all the young people who were involved in the "Sturm und Drang" of the leftist ideology around Shōwa 6 and 7 [1931-2] in Japan. I still believe that the so-called student movement at that time was, though based on a materialistic conception of history, a kind of spiritual movement in its nature. Of course, there were many who became [real] Marxists in the correct [textbook] way, developing [their] thoughts to overcome it [the spiritual side]. In respect of the main character of this novel, he took his first step into a labyrinth when he could not follow the ideology with his feet [as an activist], though his head [as well as his heart] was still attracted to the ideas.³⁵

3.1.4 The structure and plot of the novel

Meiro is set between 1935 and 1945. The life of Shōzō, who is in his late twenties, is the main focus, with the story following Shōzō's steps from Tokyo to Kyushu and then to the battlefield in China. The author acts like an omniscient god, moving the characters at will in the interests of the story. This is a very common method used by many 19th century novelists, such as Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and Dickens.

In *Meiro* Nogami takes the approach of piling up details, structuring them tightly and intricately, and drawing the threads together at the end without losing the unity,

³⁵ NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 512.

coherence and the uniformity of the world of the story. This capacity to work on a large canvas is another of Nogami's strengths as a writer.

In the first scene of *Meiro*, Shōzō, whose family background is that of a wealthy sake-brewer in Kyushu, is on the campus of Tokyo Imperial University at the time of the annual May festival. Shōzō's past denunciation of his Marxist beliefs is revealed through a conversation with a friend from his university days, good natured Oda Takeshi.³⁶ Oda was a Marxist sympathiser, but was neither expelled from the university nor ostracised by his community. By contrast, Shōzō was arrested, imprisoned for several months and released after he renounced his beliefs. Oda is still a researcher at the university, whereas Shōzō has had nothing to do with the university since his expulsion from it. Nogami's diary entry of 13 May 1936 shows that when she was about to start *Meiro*, she wanted to write about young intellectuals who were diverted from a favourable course in life because of their Marxist ideology.³⁷

Despite the fact that Shōzō is labelled by society as an "apostate",³⁸ he still believes in the ideology that ruined his career. In the depths of his mind he has not thrown away all hope that one day Marxist ideology will be proven right. He remembers his passion for revolution while walking on the campus with Oda. They talk about whether there is such a thing on earth as a state without injustice.

It appears to them [Shōzō and Oda] that they can find such a country in one northern region of the earth. The country has not achieved its purpose, but it is trying to build up a model with determination, overcoming many problems. They turn their young and burning eyes to the northern sky. ("Satsuki-sai", Chapter 1)³⁹

The country "at one northern region of the earth" is the Soviet Union. While subsequent events have shown that the idea that the communist countries, the Soviet Union and China, could be utopias is naive, it was the belief of many post-war

³⁶ The name "Takeshi" could also be read "Ken".

³⁷ *NYZ II*, vol. 5, p. 84.

³⁸ In this thesis, I use "apostasy" to translate "*tenkō*", the term used by Nogami to describe the act of renouncing one's Marxist ideology and returning to one's previous "normal", non-Marxist, values. An "apostate" (*tenkō-sha*) is one who commits this act of renunciation. "Apostasy" and "apostate" usually have strong religious connotations, and they therefore capture the religious aspect of the Marxist movement of the time.

³⁹ *NYZ I*, vol. 9, pp. 14-15.

intellectuals in Japan, at least for a time. Nogami wrote *Meiro* from an idealistic point of view, from which a belief in the search for a place where justice is done was credible. At the end of the novel, this idealistic view takes Shōzō to China as a soldier, makes him desert his army group in the face of the enemy and run towards the town of Yan'an, where the Eighth Route army and the Japanese Anti-war League are stationed, hoping it will lead him to the end of the labyrinth.

After Shōzō renounces his Marxist belief and comes out of jail, he is silent to other people's comforting words, to their feeling of relief and their encouragement to get back to his wealthy family background and its values.

He [Shōzō] has got used to being silent ... The thought came to him that the reason why one enjoys being able to be silent is similar to the fact that one has freedom to commit suicide at any time. The difference between them is only being silent for a while or forever. And his life which is possible only by being silent means that he is a suicide who is just breathing. ("Satsuki-sai", Chapter 1)⁴⁰

By being silent, Shōzō avoids making positive contact with the community where he is living. He knows that he is weak and cowardly.⁴¹ But when he encounters the love of a young woman, Mariko, it is the beginning of escape from the long tunnel, the labyrinth. Nogami describes Mariko, a Eurasian girl and a lonely orphan under the care of her businessman uncle Masui Reizō and his wife, good natured but frivolous Matsuko, as follows:

[For Mariko] solitude was the air [she breathed]. She did not feel loneliness as one does not identify each atom when one breathes the air. Her solitude was her true nature.

... She did not know that she was the most religious [person at her Catholic convent school], with her humble reflection [on herself] and her self-reproach. ("Chiisai kao", Chapter 1)⁴²

Nogami had a Eurasian granddaughter, her first son Soichi's daughter from his first marriage. Though they were separated from an early stage of the girl's life, they

⁴⁰ NYZ I, vol. 9, p. 47.

⁴¹ NYZ I, vol. 9, p. 207.

⁴² NYZ I, vol. 9, pp. 118 and 120.

corresponded regularly. Nogami always loved this granddaughter and felt sorry that she could not live close to her. Nogami's unfulfilled love for her granddaughter appears in her caring description of Mariko.

In *Meiro*, the life of Shōzō and the other characters, and the fate of Japan between 1935 and 1945, are explored not only from Shōzō's perspective, but also through the eyes of the old Count Eshima Munemichi. *Meiro* is unique because of this multi-layered structure, which was then rare in Japanese literature. Short stories were the main literary form, a tendency which still persists.⁴³

Eshima Munemichi and Shōzō never cross paths in the story. Count Eshima has transferred the leadership of his family to his younger brother Hidemichi, an opportunistic bureaucrat and one of those who are leading Japan to war. Nogami's descriptions of Hidemichi are full of derision. Count Eshima, who is, to some degree, modelled on a grandson of the statesman, Ii Naosuke⁴⁴ (1815-1860), lives in retirement with his long-term mistress, Tomi. Eshima still has deep respect for and pride in his grandfather and hates the opportunists who gained power and profit on the death of his grandfather at the dawn of the Meiji Restoration. His everyday life revolves around his only love and passion, Noh. He is a patron of a famous Noh actor, Umewaka Manzaburō. Eshima sees Manzaburō as the one and only vessel of the skills, beauty and tradition of Noh. While secluding himself from society, Eshima still sees the direction in which Japan is heading. In his view, contrary to that of his bureaucrat brother, getting involved in war is pure stupidity. Eshima's views about Noh and Japanese culture generally, and his despair at the fate of Japan, seem all to be Nogami's, and are expressed by Eshima's thoughts and conversations with Tomi, Manzaburō and Hidemichi.⁴⁵ Eshima inquires deeply into a particular art, Noh, and this search makes him a seeker after truth with a

⁴³ See Kaga Otohiko, "Nogami Yaeko ron", *Buntai*, 4, (Tokyo: June 1978), p.88 and Shinoda Kazu-shi, "Meiro no koto", *Tosho*, 370, (Tokyo: June 1980), pp. 25-26.

⁴⁴ Ii Naosuke was a senior official of the Tokugawa shogunate who strongly supported the end of *sakoku*, national isolation. He was assassinated by a group of his opponents while he was carrying out the Ansei purge. *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 1, p. 416-417, *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*, vol. 1, p. 63 and vol. 3, p. 263.

⁴⁵ "Eshima Munemichi" and "Aki", in Chapter 3, *NYZ I*, vol. 10, pp. 5-44 and pp. 247-288 respectively.

strictly disciplined daily life structured by meditation. This search gives him discernment as to Japan's situation.

There is a contrast between Shōzō, representing the conscience of the younger generation, and Eshima, representing that of the older.⁴⁶ Shōzō thinks he can overcome the problem represented by Japanese fascism and the consequent war, while Eshima does not. Eshima's deep resignation comes from his knowledge of how the opportunists, who gained power in the Meiji government, utilised his grandfather's death and the fact that his own brother, Hidemichi, is an opportunistic bureaucrat who is trying to profit from the chaos of war-time Japan.

The relationship between Shōzō and Tazue, who have known each other since childhood, is another important thread. Though Tazue is described as a selfish realist who loves luxury, her love for Shōzō, while difficult to categorise, supports Shōzō in many ways. It enables him to cut the relationship with a beautiful but lascivious and selfish Viscountess, Atō Mihoko, and helps him to come to Mariko's love.

There are many unforgettable characters in *Meiro*. Setsu is an example. She is the wife of Shōzō's friend, another "apostate", Kizu Masao. Setsu was born in poverty and left home to work when she was eleven. With her diligence and desire to improve herself she becomes a nurse. After experiencing a nurses' strike in the hospital where she works, she follows a leader of the strike to Tokyo where she meets Kizu, a leftist activist. Because of her experience of poverty, Setsu is easily led by Kizu to an acceptance of communism. She interprets communist ideology as meaning that everybody should get daily bread equally, and she accepts this without question, because finding daily bread was a serious problem around her. After Kizu renounces his communist beliefs, then becomes a hooligan in Manchuria, Setsu still believes in communist values and does not lose hope that Kizu will find his way back to decency. Her belief does not change after she has a miscarriage and gets divorced. She dies during a physical struggle with secret police officers, trying to help the leader of a communist group to escape. Kizu later comes to know of Setsu's death, and this makes him decide to return to his communist beliefs. He meets Shōzō in China when Shōzō is a soldier of the Japanese army, and gives Shōzō an important message which leads him to desert in order to join the Japanese

⁴⁶ "Meiro o owatte", *NYZ I*, suppl. 1, p. 300. Nogami says in this interview that she wanted to capture the contrasting consciences of the younger and older generation. See also Sakasai, *Nogami Yaeko*, pp. 247-263.

anti-war league in Yan'an. Setsu stands in strong contrast to Tazue in terms of social class, to the many who renounce Marxism as a faithful disciple, and to political opportunists as a firm adherent to her principles.

Although a majority of the characters of *Meiro* belong to the rich upper class, the social structure of the novel goes vertically through Japanese society of the time. The upper class is represented by rich nobles such as Count Eshima, his brother Hidemichi, Viscount and Viscountess Atō, the top politician Tarumi Jūta, Tazue's father, the successful businessman Masui Reizō, Mariko's uncle, and Shōzō, whose family owns a wealthy sake-brewing business in Kyushu and has a strong connection with Tarumi Jūta and Masui Reizō. On the other hand, there is Setsu, born in poverty in a tiny fishing village and without a father, and Kizu, from a poor peasant background. Nogami herself belonged to the upper class. However, her warm description of Setsu or Kizu shows her compassion for and understanding of the poor.

What kind of message do we get from *Meiro*? Nogami's themes of love and pacifism, and her suggestions as to how we human beings should live, are not in themselves strikingly new. Furthermore, as mentioned above, Nogami wrote this novel while she believed in the success of the socialist experiment. However, in the postscript to the initial version written in 1936, Nogami stated that the characters would keep coming back before the reader as the occasion required, and in this way declared her decision to share imaginatively the fate of those young people who were forced to the margins of society because of their beliefs. This postscript indicates her determination to present the depth of perspective of those young people's life in a favourable light.

Meiro also contains a brilliant presentation of how love works powerfully in our minds. Shōzō's last act, deserting the Japanese army, reflects the love and determination of Mariko, Tazue, Kizu, Setsu, Oda and therefore Nogami herself. Shōzō's last act demonstrates his love for human beings and his determination to follow "humanist" values and to reject militarism. Through Shōzō Nogami shows that those values are worth risking one's life for. When Shōzō becomes the target of both the Japanese soldiers at his back and the Chinese communists in front of him at the entrance of the village of Yan'an, he shouts to the Chinese not to shoot him as he is their friend. He then feels a shot in his back: "What caused Shōzō to be covered with blood and fall unconscious on the cultivated field was a bullet from today's enemy and yesterday's ally"

("Dassō", Chapter 6).⁴⁷ It is not clear whether Shōzō died.⁴⁸

3.2 Shōzō's background

In the previous section I discussed the prefigurement of Shōzō in other stories by Nogami. In this section I would like to discuss Shōzō's background, in other words, his life prior to his forced renunciation of Marxism, by examining the student movement in the early Shōwa era under the dark clouds of fascism and especially the spread of Marxism among young Japanese intellectuals in opposition to Japanese militarism. The sympathy of Shōzō and other young intellectuals for the poor, their desperate struggle against fascism and their hope for the future are also Nogami's.

3.2.1 The Early Shōwa student movement

Shōzō is a son of a wealthy sake-brewer in Kyushu. Nogami derives the name of his home town from that of her own, transforming Usuki into Yoshiki.⁴⁹ Shōzō comes to Tokyo early in the Shōwa era (1926-1989) to enter Tokyo Imperial University, the top university in Japan, where he encounters and becomes involved in the leftist movement.

The student movement just before the Shōwa era gained strength from its support for academic freedom and student autonomy. From the point of view of the police, the student movement was part of the overall left-wing movement, which they viewed as criminal and a threat to society. From the educators' point of view, however, it was indicative of a much broader problem, namely deep-seated deficiencies in the education system. Before the Shōwa era, educators believed that student radicals were not criminals but misguided, unfortunate souls.

At the same time as the education authorities put a lot of effort into patriotic education, the suppression of the student movement started around 1924-1925, not in universities but in high schools. (The setting of Nogami's 1932 story, "Wakai musuko",

⁴⁷ NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 467.

⁴⁸ My understanding is that Shōzō did not die. See section 2.9, "After the war", particularly the discussion of Nogami's plan to write a sequel to *Meiro* featuring Shōzō.

⁴⁹ The name could be read "Yuki", but I take "Yoshiki" as the best reading because it has the same number of syllables as "Usuki" and sounds similar.

is a high school where this suppression is practiced.) The suppression of the student movement did not have a noticeable effect until March 1928, because it was not well coordinated.

On the 15th of March 1928, there was a mass arrest of leftist activists.⁵⁰ According to the *Tokyo Asahi shinbun*, the majority of students arrested were from imperial universities.⁵¹ The government put "student supervisors" in each university to control student activities and to be ready for on-campus arrests. However, the number of students involved in the movement increased and reached its peak between 1930 and 1932, together with the proletarian literary movement. Between 1930 and 1934, the period when Shōzō was a student at Tokyo Imperial University, over 6000 students from high schools and imperial universities were arrested for leftist activities, 700 of whom were from Tokyo Imperial University. Shōzō is one of these.

The economic depression was another factor in the spread of the leftist movement. Unemployment among university and college graduates, which was less than 20 per cent in 1923, increased dramatically to more than 60 per cent in 1931. This gave impetus to the left, which was ready to seize the political advantage, while the wave of student unrest reached its height, despite mass arrests. This era was called "the age of chronic student disturbances".⁵²

3.2.2 Marxism, Japanese intellectuals and the end of the student movement

Marxism and Christianity were two major systems of belief which were introduced into Japan from the West after the end of national isolation. Japan came into contact with other Western philosophies, but Marxism and Christianity had by far the greatest impact on Japanese intellectuals.

Marxism had some academic attractions. First of all, Japanese intellectuals learned to think of social reality as a total phenomenon, rather than in terms of the

⁵⁰ Nosaka Sanzō, to whom Nogami asked for advice for a sequel to *Meiro*, was one of those arrested.

⁵¹ H. D. Smith, II, *Japan's First Student Radicals* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 200. I have consulted *Japan's First Student Radicals* extensively in writing this section.

⁵² Smith, *Japan's First Student Radicals*, p. 200.

discrete fields of politics, law, philosophy or economics. They also learned to look at history as a meaningful and law-governed process of development.

Secondly, Marxism taught the relationship between thought and action. Marxism demanded of Japanese intellectuals that if they studied a particular system of thought and agreed with it, they should live according to its principles. From the Marxist point of view, thought is not simply for understanding the world but also for changing it. Japanese intellectuals learned from Marxism that ideas are not objects with which to play mental games but guides to responsibility for one's actions. These were the major reasons why Marxism spread among the highly educated and idealistic, such as university students.⁵³

Although Marxism has a materialistic view of the world and of history, the student movement in the early Shōwa era received from Marxism a strongly humanist message in keeping with the early rather than the later writings of Marx. Nogami's emphasis in *Meiro* is on this "humanism",⁵⁴ which was also a legacy of other Western ideals such as democracy, individualism, and civil liberty.⁵⁵

After the mass arrests of 1928, it became clear to the left that a strong link between the student movement and the Communist Party was needed for the party to survive. But a major obstacle from the Communist Party's point of view was that the majority of the student radicals were "unreliable bourgeois intellectuals". Shōzō was obviously one of these. It seems that Shōzō followed the path of many other intellectuals at that time by joining the Communist Youth League,⁵⁶ which started in 1929 as a half-way house between the student movement and the Japanese Communist Party.

However, parallel to the rise of nationalistic sentiment and Japanese militarism, especially after the Manchuria Incident (September 1931), the tide of the student movement began to slacken, although during the next few years the number of school disturbances remained high. In May 1933, the so-called Takikawa Incident occurred. This

⁵³ Maruyama Masao, *Nihon no shisō* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961), pp. 55-56.

⁵⁴ See section 3.1.3, "Important characters prefigured in previous works", note on "humanism" in the Japanese context.

⁵⁵ See the interview with Hirano Ken, "Rekishiteki genjitsu to sōzō", *NYZ I*, suppl. 1, p. 311.

⁵⁶ Diary entry of 16 May 1936, *NYZ II*, vol. 5, p. 87, in which Nogami writes that the main character would be an apostate, 26 or 27 years old, related to the Communist Youth League and studying the humanities. He would have a passive personality.

involved the dismissal of Kyoto Imperial University law professor Takikawa Yukitoshi from an examination committee. He was pressured to resign his position and his widely-used textbook on criminal law, *Keihō dokuhon*, was banned. He had been accused in a right-wing brochure of favouring leftist students for an entrance examination. The actions against Professor Takikawa provoked student protests all over Japan against the violation of academic autonomy.⁵⁷ A few months later, however, Sano Manabu and Nabeyama Sadachika, both well-known communists, retracted their beliefs, and a mass "apostasy" of communists followed. When Minobe Tatsukichi was indicted for "*lèse majesté*" because of his so-called "the emperor as-an-instrument of state theory" in 1935, student protest became a thing of the past.

In circumstances such as these, Shōzō became a leftist, was arrested, was imprisoned and forced to retract his leftist beliefs. He felt he was a failure, as did many young intellectuals who embraced and then renounced Marxism. When a real-life "apostate" criticised "Kuroi gyōretsu" in a university newspaper, saying that the description of Shōzō was too one-sided and emphasising there were many tough-minded apostates who did not recant as easily as Shōzō did, Nogami wrote in her diary on 6 November 1936:

His criticism has a reasonable side. However, the way he attacks me, because I didn't describe an "apostate" as he wished, is a kind of self-justification [by half truth]. There were some "apostates" who were strong and some who were not. The author [of "Kuroi gyōretsu"] had an equally intense interest in apostates and in the women of the bourgeoisie.⁵⁸

3.3 Patterns of conflicting ideas in *Meiro*

Nogami brought her beliefs and philosophy concretely into the novel. As mentioned in the Introduction, the influence of the study of philosophy with Tanabe Hajime, who had been a critical reader of *Meiro* when it was published in monthly instalments in the magazine *Sekai*,⁵⁹ seemed to have great impact not only on *Meiro*, but also

⁵⁷ See "Takikawa jiken", *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 9, p. 94 and "The Kyoto University Incident", *Kodan-sha Encyclopedia of Japan*, vol. 4, p. 339,

⁵⁸ *NYZ II*, vol. 5, p. 210.

⁵⁹ Diary entries of 19 August and 21 November 1952, and of 7 April 1953, *NYZ II*, vol. 11, pp. 301, 331-332 and p. 390, respectively.

on Nogami's subsequent works. Tanabe actually encouraged Nogami to study philosophy more thoroughly, because he believed it was necessary for her to complete the last part (about the last third) of *Meiro*.⁶⁰ She agreed.

I have said that Nogami's works are characterised by patterns of conflict. There are many pairs of contrasting ideas in *Meiro*, expressed in various ways, which are a further development of the patterns of conflict characteristic of her earlier work (*Machiko*, "Wakai musuko", "Mebae" and "Kanashiki shōnen"). The main contrasts are war and peace, and fascism and "humanism". Around these main streams of conflict, other conflicts are interwoven, such as the younger generation against the conventional pressure exerted by the older generation and individualism against totalitarian suppression. These conflicts can be understood, according to Nogami, as the conflict between society as a collective and the human being as individual.⁶¹ In this section I will examine the major conflicts in the novel.

3.3.1 Fascism and "humanism"

Two of the central themes of *Meiro* are pacifism and "humanism". The main character, Shōzō, challenged Japanese fascism, failed, and afterwards struggled through a labyrinth in order to catch up with his conscience. He went to war, only because he could not accept the special treatment which enabled those who belonged to the politically powerful upper class to avoid doing so.

"Black Line" ("Kuroi gyōretsu", the title of the first chapter of *Meiro*) is a symbol of fascism. Nogami's position is clear. She takes no part in Japanese militarism by supporting the government. Instead she looks at fascism as an object to be examined. She carefully examines where it comes from, what sort of people support it, what results from it, and then criticises it and resists its overwhelming power: the power which is supported by the whole Japanese nation, and which tries to suppress any criticism or resistance. Because of her strong "humanism", she wants to share the sorrow which ordinary people have to suffer. One needs tremendous intellectual and moral strength to

⁶⁰ Diary entry of 5 January 1954, *NYZ II*, vol. 12, p. 5.

⁶¹ "Rekishiteki genjitsu to sōzō", *NYZ I*, suppl. 1, p. 318. Individual freedom becomes one of the main themes of Nogami's next novel, "Hideyoshi to Rikyū".

go against a predominant current. Where did Nogami get this strength? She saw the light of "humanism" in the leftist movement among the young intellectuals. Her strength could be rather simple. Nogami's basic attitude of moral judgement was always whether or not a belief, thought or act is morally coherent. Her strong sense of justice was totally at odds with Japanese fascism. When the Manchuria Incidents occurred she thought the way Japan invaded Manchuria resembled a family with many children or relatives extending their house into the neighbour's land without the latter's consent,⁶² and she called it the act of a thief. Nogami worried about the expansion of Japanese militarism. She wrote a short essay for the *Asahi shinbun* in January 1937, the year the Sino-Japanese War broke out, when she was writing the original "Meiro":

It is all right if there is a flood, a great earthquake, a fire, a storm, a volcanic eruption or an epidemic of cholera and plague together. [However,] please do not let there be war. ("Hitotsu no negigoto")⁶³

This shows Nogami's desperate fear of war expressed as a wish that war not come. This fear is also expressed in her 1935 short story "Kanashiki shōnen".

In order to criticise an object, one must have a certain distance from it. It is also necessary to recognise that conflicting ideas often each contain an element of truth and that synthesis of these truths produces an advance in knowledge. Nogami kept her distance from Marxism, fascism, and even herself, in terms of having an objective view of her own thoughts and acts, even though she was among those who stood up for "humanism". Despite the fact that she lived in the political and ideological storm in which the nation was swept towards fascism and war, she kept a clear mental distance from her compatriots and kept this distance throughout the war. (Nogami referred in her diary entry of 16 August 1945, the day after the surrender, to the urgent necessity of Japan engaging in humble and thorough introspection.)⁶⁴ When the leftist movement reached its peak, Nogami also remained critical of it, and when a mass apostasy of communists occurred, her position did not change. She chose an apostate as the main character of *Meiro* and made him chase the lost dream of "humanism", which never left him, even when he bowed to Japanese militarism. Nogami held onto "humanism". This is presented in *Meiro* as an anti-war attitude, and this is the backbone of the novel. During the

⁶² See an interview with Honda Katsuichi, "Betonamu sensō no imi", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 184.

⁶³ *NYZ I*, vol. 19, p. 137.

⁶⁴ *NYZ II*, vol. 9, p. 86.

worst period of Japanese contemporary history, she chose not to continue the story rather than to ingratiate herself with the government.

3.3.2 Blindness and clearsightedness

The characters in *Meiro* live and die through a ten-year period, under the gathering clouds of fascism. The novel finishes just before a major air raid on Tokyo, probably modelled on that of 10 March 1945, five months before Japan's unconditional surrender. During these five months, Japan experienced many air strikes, including the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In this section I would like to discuss how these individuals in the story act, on what motivation, and how they reflect Nogami's individualism, in terms of a resistance to fascism. Her individualism, imported from Western philosophy, is based on individual freedom in the form of civil liberties. This freedom does not belong to an oppressed and cowardly mind, but to an awakened mind.

After renouncing Marxism, Shōzō is given a job by Viscount Atō thanks to a family connection - the politician Tarumi, Tazue's father, who takes pity on Shōzō's situation. This job is just enough to give Shōzō his daily bread. Because of his status as a former communist, he considers himself in no position to give direction to others. When he was a communist he was talkative, even provocative, ready to tell others what to do, but then he publicly accepted that he was wrong; and so, despite having much to say, he remains silent. His leftist ideas have not disappeared. He is an "apostate" publicly but not in his heart. In a scene in which Shōzō sees Tarumi, there is a clear contrast between the power and success represented by Tarumi and Shōzō's powerlessness and failure. This scene also contrasts garrulity and silence, Tarumi's colourful yet empty words and Shōzō's deep thought which he is unable to express. Shōzō's silent rejection of Tarumi and his view of the world does not appear in their conversation.

When Shōzō observes the confident Ehata, the secretary of Mariko's businessman uncle Masui and a candidate for Mariko's hand in marriage, Shōzō has a feeling of revulsion. He thinks:

Those who slipped into favourable posts in society after going through high school and university [during the early 1930s] without being troubled by affliction, being tormented by agony, being labelled as "apostates" or being swept off their feet, are either incredibly lucky, extremely cunning or hopelessly stupid,

whether or not they agree with the new economic view of the world that seized [the heart of] the younger generation at that time. ("Aoi yume", Chapter 3)⁶⁵

This represents Nogami's point of view. Here she emphasises the clear contrast between those who were troubled because they could not close their eyes to injustice, and those who were selfish.

The first section of the second chapter of *Meiro* is called "Kuroi nagare" (Black Stream). The black stream of fascism in Japan is gaining momentum and strength. The chapter begins on the morning of the 26th of February 1936, the day of the so-called 2.26 Incident, when several ministers of the Japanese government were assassinated by a group of army officers in a coup attempt.

Shōzō goes to the site of the coup attempt with Oda, looking for their mutual friend Kizu (also a former communist) who now works as a third-class newspaper journalist. In a large crowd in front of a government building, Shōzō sees a young, low-ranking soldier. The soldier seems to be excited and to be blindly following his senior, who is asking the crowd for their understanding.

"[Father, forgive them for] they know not what they do". While watching the innocent smile of the young soldier, that phrase stuck to [Shōzō's] skull like a votive slip. ("Kuroi nagare", Chapter 2)⁶⁶

One is awake, the other is blind. Shōzō realised that he once tried to open the young soldier's blind eyes to the reality of human society but quit the task half way. He felt painfully that he was just one of the curious crowd.⁶⁷ As Sakasai says in *Nogami Yaeko*, what Shōzō felt was a reflection of Nogami's feeling.⁶⁸ Shōzō's helplessness was not only his but also Nogami's; it was the helplessness of many Japanese who were awake at that time. Nogami wanted to say that those who were tortured or went to jail because of their pacifism were not the only ones who regretted what was going on. Because of her powerlessness and fear, the only thing she could do was hope. Nogami's fear of censorship by the government was already well-founded when she was writing the original "Meiro" in September 1937.⁶⁹ She knew that she would soon have to be silent.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ NYZ I, vol. 10, p. 155.

⁶⁶ NYZ I, vol. 9, pp. 298-299.

⁶⁷ NYZ I, vol. 9, p. 300.

⁶⁸ Sakasai, *Nogami Yaeko*, p. 242.

⁶⁹ Diary entry of 12 September 1937, NYZ II, vol. 5, p. 405.

When Shōzō is on his way back from the coup site, he says sadly, "It's snowing again". This is the only thing he can say. Nogami wrote this scene as a reflection of her sadness and helplessness. It is one of the unforgettable scenes in the novel.⁷¹

The attitude of Count Eshima Munemichi toward Japanese militarism is one of contempt. He tries to ignore it. His contempt includes his bureaucrat brother Hidemichi. Eshima holds political opportunists and people without principle in utter contempt. This attitude leads him into isolation from society. He cannot put up with blind obedience to power, seeing obedience as sleep while he is awake. However, he does not give voice to his concern even when he hears about the outbreak of the Pacific War, which he considers a stupid choice on the part of the Japanese government. His silence is not because of fear of censorship; it is due to deep resignation in the face of those opportunists who run the country and the blind crowd that follows them. He puts his passion solely into the traditional art of Noh. Whenever Eshima talks about Noh, Nogami's knowledge and passion for Noh appear strongly. Both Eshima and Nogami hate war as a potential destroyer of the eternal and traditional Japanese art.

Eshima, however, believes that true art will remain despite the war, just as Shōzō believes in the depth of his mind that the ideology he has will never die despite the temporary setback. Sakasai notes contrasting attitudes in the two men: while Eshima is resigned, Shōzō continues to hope.⁷² There is some truth in this, but my view is slightly different. Eshima protects the Noh actor, Umewaka Manzaburō, and his art, while he prepares himself for death in the March 1945 air raid on Tokyo. He persuades or rather forces Manzaburō to be evacuated from dangerous Tokyo to the safer countryside. From Eshima's point of view, Manzaburō is the one who should be on the ark when the Great Flood covers the earth. I consider that this shows Eshima's hope for the future of Japan. His hope was, like Shōzō's and Nogami's, that one day the Japanese nation would lose its militaristic illusions, despite the current dark situation. When Manzaburō comes to say farewell to Eshima, the latter refers to the Noh play "Sotoba Komachi" as follows:

... has there been any playwright in any country through all the ages who made a hundred year old woman such a beautiful heroine? I've never heard of it, nor read about it. [Noh] is a great art unique to that one man [Zeami].⁷³ Probably

⁷⁰ Letter 219 of 15 September 1937, *NYZ II*, vol. 24, pp. 302-304

⁷¹ Subsequently I have found that Sakasai describes this scene in exactly the same way.

⁷² Sakasai, *Nogami Yaeko*, p. 258.

only Japanese can enjoy it; it is too much for Westerners. If you think this way, it means, though the one who wrote and danced them [Noh plays] was Zeami, the one who made Zeami write and dance them was every Japanese. This is the promising point. In this sort of area, Japan compares quite favourably with other countries. Even a bomb can't annihilate this [art]. We mustn't let it be annihilated. [When you think] about the Great Flood in Christianity, [you realise] there are various things which should be on the ark. But for me, I want to put you, Manzaburō, on it first. ("Hakobune no hito", Chapter 6)⁷⁴

Eshima knows painfully that it is not he who should be on the ark.⁷⁵ He knows that he is a passing phenomenon compared to Noh, which belongs to eternity.

Tazue chooses a loveless marriage because she knows that she cannot throw away the luxurious lifestyle she has been used to. She chooses to marry the son of a plutocrat although she knows her future husband is an unfaithful man. It does not bother her, as long as she has as much freedom as before the marriage. Tazue's sharp realism, on the other hand, gives a timely warning to Shōzō about his affair with Viscountess Ato Mihoko, who draws Shōzō into deep mental turmoil. Since Tazue is a realist and awake, she is able to judge rightly the circumstances of Japan. She foresees the defeat of Japanese militarism. Being awake, she contrasts strongly with other frivolous characters such as Mariko's aunt Matsuko, who eagerly support Japanese militarism with their ignorance and shallow heroism, and her insight leads her into trouble with the police. Tazue had been overheard to remark that if you see one swallow in early spring, then you know hundreds will follow, referring to an American aircraft that appeared in the Japanese sky. This logical observation is made privately to a friend, but it is not tolerated by the authorities. Police officers scorn and threaten her.⁷⁶

Tazue hates war because of the violence it does to the thoughts, speech and decisions of individuals. In her view, freedom to think and express oneself is inalienable. But most Japanese did not see it in that way at the time. Her pride refuses to accept that anyone has the right to tell her what she should or should not do. Because of her

⁷³ Zeami (1363-1443) was the actor, playwright and critic who established Noh.

⁷⁴ *NYZ I*, vol. 11, pp. 495-496.

⁷⁵ *NYZ I*, vol. 11, pp. 492-493.

⁷⁶ The details of Tazue's experience with the police are in the section "Tsuiraku" of the fifth chapter of *Meiro*, *NYZ I*, vol. 11, pp. 99-107.

careless, though coherent, words about an American aircraft, she is put in a situation in which she has to leave Japan temporarily. During the trip to Shanghai, her plane crashes, and Tazue dies from the resulting injuries. Her death is thus tied to her awareness and acknowledgement of the inevitability of Japan's defeat.

3.3.3 Ambivalence within Nogami

Nogami's own experience during the war was similar to Tazue's. According to her diary entries of 12, 13 & 14 May and 12 June 1945, she was summoned by the police because of a private talk with a friend, during which she joked about the Emperor. During the war, the Japanese did not have freedom of speech. Emperor Hirohito was a quasi-divinity and no one was allowed to criticise or joke about him. In 1953, well after the end of the war, Nogami published *Sansō-ki*, which consists of her diaries between 3 November 1944 and 3 November 1945.⁷⁷ However, the diary entries describing her experiences with the police are omitted. Nogami must have judged that making this experience public was not wise even in 1953, despite the fact that in the same year she wrote in her diary that she was proud of never having condoned the war.⁷⁸ Why this contradiction? Her rather too cautious attitude affects *Meiro*. Despite the declaration in the preface to the rewritten versions of the first and the second chapter of *Meiro* in 1948, in which she says that she does not need to worry about censorship any longer, Nogami's pen was still chained in some way when she came to resume *Meiro*. She carefully avoided criticising Emperor Hirohito and his role during the period of Japanese fascism, although she clearly criticised him in her diaries. The only reason she ever gave for this avoidance is rather weak, and she does not seem herself to recognise its weakness. Nogami says in her diary entry of 29 March 1974, referring to a critical essay on *Meiro* by Kaga Otohiko⁷⁹: "... He pointed out that there is a lack of criticism of the Emperor which should be there. This is true, but when I was writing the novel, we were not

⁷⁷ *Sansō-ki* (first pub. Tokyo: Kurashi no techōsha, 1953) consists of "Sansō-ki" [Diary entries from 3 November to 26 December 1944] (Tokyo: Seikatsusha, November 1945), "Zoku sansō-ki" [Diary entries from 27 December 1944 to 3 March 1945] (Tokyo: Seikatsusha, February 1946) and the last addition to Diary entries from 7 March to 3 November 1945. *NYZ I*, vol. pp. 3-146.

⁷⁸ Diary entry of 28 March 1953, *NYZ II*, vol. 11, p. 386.

⁷⁹ Kaga, "Ai to sensō no kōzu - *Meiro*".

allowed to touch on the issue with the freedom that young people enjoy nowadays. This is not an excuse."⁸⁰

But in what sense did Nogami use the word "freedom"? She seemed to have a good understanding of and respect for John Stuart Mill.⁸¹ She clearly identified the freedom of a state or a community and freedom of the individual as conflicting ideals and said later (in 1957) that she should have thought this conflict through more deeply when she was writing *Meiro*.⁸² In my view, it seems that despite the fact that she had a liberal idea of freedom (as long as one does not encroach on the freedom of others one should be left to live as one chooses,) Nogami could not practice this freedom. It was not the social circumstances, but something within Nogami herself which stopped her from criticising the Emperor. There were in fact many people who publicly criticised either Emperor Hirohito or the imperial system, or both, between the end of the war and 1956, the year Nogami completed *Meiro*. Examples include Arai Sakunosuke,⁸³ Maruyama Masao,⁸⁴ Ōyama Ikuo,⁸⁵ and Murakami Hyōe.⁸⁶

The year Nogami published *Sansō-ki* (1953), she was writing the fifth (penultimate) chapter of *Meiro*. Although *Meiro*'s main theme is pacifism, and there are severe criticisms of Emperor Hirohito in her diary, there is no criticism of the Emperor or the Japanese imperial system in the novel, as if she were still afraid of the abolished law of "*lèse majesté*". I suggest that her omission of that part of her diary which treats of her experience with the police during the war as a result of her joking about Emperor Hirohito, and her deliberate avoidance of criticism of the Emperor in *Meiro*, have the same

⁸⁰ NYZ II, vol. 17(2), pp. 240-241.

⁸¹ Dairy entry of 1 October 1937, NYZ II, vol. 5, p.426 and the record of a discussion, "Sekai o gensuibaku no hai de yogosuna", NYZ I, suppl. 1, pp. 322-331.

⁸² See the interview with Hirano Ken, "Rekishiteki genjitsu to sōzō", NYZ I, suppl. 1, pp. 307-321.

⁸³ Arai Sakunosuke, "Fugōri no gensen", *Tōdai shinbun* (Tokyo: 1946); cited in *Sengo Nihon Shisō Taikei 1*, *Sengo shisō no shuppatsu*, pp. 159-168.

⁸⁴ Maruyama, "Gunkoku shihaisha no seishin-keitai"; cited in *Sengo Nihon Shisō Taikei 1*, *Sengo shisō no shuppatsu*, pp. 187-222.

⁸⁵ Ōyama Ikuo, "Sensō sekinin to tennō no taii", *Chūō kōron* (Tokyo: 1948); cited in *Sengo Nihon Shisō Taikei 5*, *Kokka no shisō*, pp. 275-281.

⁸⁶ Murakami Hyōe, "Tennō no sensō sekinin", *Chūō kōron* (Tokyo: 1956); cited in *Sengo Nihon Shisō Taikei 5*, *Kokka no shisō*, pp. 300-316.

root. The following is her diary entry of 2 February 1947, just eighteen months after the end of the war:

[After finishing Friedrich Engels', *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*], ... how many items, which should be put in a museum, we have in current Japan! However, we still haven't been able to transfer even the Emperor, a single human being, [to a museum]. At the same time we have to reflect on ourselves [and accept the fact] that there is a very similar phenomenon in our minds.⁸⁷

There is almost no mention of the Emperor in *Meiro*.⁸⁸ This is a severe shortcoming. Nogami says in her diary that she would not be able to avoid writing about the Emperor if she wrote a sequel to *Meiro*.⁸⁹ However, a sequel was never written.

3.3.4 Individual freedom and traditional convention

The character Mariko resists the pressure of convention and tradition which tells her that she should obey the decision made by her guardians, her uncle and his wife, about her marriage. She dislikes several candidates introduced by her aunt, Matsuko, but she does not argue. She simply says "No," uttering a single syllable, and does not change her answer. In order to keep fighting the pressures on her, Mariko keeps alive her dream of becoming a primary school teacher. This wish, to become a working woman, sounds preposterous to Matsuko and the people around her. Matsuko tirelessly searches for 'suitable' young men for Mariko, not realising that the search itself is her enjoyment. Mariko keeps resisting until she is forced to give reasons for her refusal. She then falsely says that she loves Shōzō and that they are engaged. Tazue is the only one who realises that at one level Mariko believes that she does not love Shōzō, but at another level she does, and tries to bring Shōzō and Mariko together. This is a fortunate change for Mariko. They marry, and Shōzō loves Mariko and supports her dream. This is a victory for

⁸⁷ NYZ II, vol. 9, p. 409.

⁸⁸ Nogami's only published negative comment about the Emperor is in the two lines of her 1947 essay "*Fujin kōron kantō-gen*", which was written after reading Engels' *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, in which Nogami wrote that from a Westerners' perspective the imperial system would be as anachronistic as a bronze axe. NYZ I, vol. 20, p. 335.

⁸⁹ Diary entry of 15 February 1975, NYZ II, vol. 17(2), p. 399.

Mariko's honesty and her resistance against resignation. Among the many characters who are full of deceit and hypocrisy, represented especially by the bureaucrat Hidemichi (Eshima) and Viscountess Atō, Mariko's honesty shines through the novel.

When Shōzō receives a call-up card from the military authorities, Mariko pleads with him not to go. This is another instance of her honesty and refusal to succumb to traditional hypocrisy, according to which family members of any Japanese soldier must be proud of the fact that their husband or son is an honourable soldier of the Emperor.

"Don't go, please!" [Mariko] declares distinctly. She looked as if she cared for nothing and did not hide her request from the people in front [of them].

... Shōzō was used to such behaviour from his wife. On the one hand she did not talk much and was obedient and quiet to all, just as before she got married, but on the other hand, once she had decided something she did things without any hesitation, as freely as she wishes. [Mariko's request in front of other people] made even Shōzō lose his composure. At the same time, he thought Mariko admirable because she could behave so honestly. ("Aka-gami no hi", Chapter 5)⁹⁰

In China, Shōzō receives a letter from Mariko which makes him shiver because of her daring and bold honesty. She says in her letter that the task that Shōzō was carrying out when he was at university, and which led him to be called a Red, was a good and noble one. She also says that those Reds began what God⁹¹ wished to have done. Her prayer is now not only that Shōzō will come back alive but also that he will return to the work of communism. Shōzō's fear of the censors reaches its height, since he believes that Mariko may write another letter like this.

This letter of Mariko's, however, becomes an essential and final element determining Shōzō to set a Chinese captive free and desert the Japanese army, escaping with the captive. Of course, Shōzō does not make the decision at once. Mariko's trust in God is distant from him. Although he does not reject her prayer, he could not himself ask God what to do.

He tried to be objective to the best of his ability ... Her God or faith belonged to [something] far away from him ... He had not changed his previous belief that

⁹⁰ NYZ I, vol. 11, pp. 254 and 255 respectively.

⁹¹ Mariko is a Christian, although not a baptised one. See 'Mariko no tegami', in "Tō no aru oka", Chapter 6, NYZ I, vol. 11, pp. 317-323.

these things had nothing to do with him. Anyway he thought he had not. This denial, however, made a bleak, wintry hollow somewhere in his heart. This [hollow] was probably either the sadness caused by being indifferent to the earnest prayer and to the humble wish of his wife's love, or by the loneliness of watching someone else who had crossed over the water [to God] by herself while he could not follow - or perhaps it was both. ("Chō-sensei", Chapter 6)⁹²

His mind swings like a pendulum. In China he witnesses, as one of the invaders, the misery of the invaded. While on the one hand he agrees with the old saying that once you start a war, you must win, Nogami writes:

However, what will victory give to Japan? Although there are various causes for this war, the [war] is ultimately an achievement of the military clique as a conqueror and the work of the opportunistic politicians and capitalists. Shōzō does not doubt the [natural] law according to which victory will belong only to them. This will make them affirm the military conquest ... They do not care about the fact that their profit and honour are built upon the corpses of millions of soldiers and upon the living death of their young wives, children and old parents who are left in grief. All those victims are merely the manure for their growing confidence ... The post-war economic collapse, poverty and the large number of unemployed spat out from factories are common necessary [phenomena] for both the victor and the defeated. In order to deal with these problems, they will choose a quick operation with the attitude of military men: holding a gun and pulling the trigger. Surely [this is] the easiest. Thus the reservists of industry will receive military uniforms instead of unemployment benefits, and be dragged away to new battle front lines. If [these people] complain, the Maintenance of the Public Order Act, torture and imprisonment await [them]. Is this the victor Japan? ("Furiko", Chapter 6)⁹³

The pendulum in Shōzō's mind does not stop, from right to left, sense of justice to cowering silence, honesty to cunning manoeuvre, living conscience to failed conscience and "humanism" to collaboration with fascism. Through the swings of Shōzō's mind, Nogami describes the swings of conscience of all conscientious intellectuals of the time. She did not believe in the possibility of a soldier like Shōzō when she wrote *Meiro*. Shōzō's behaviour as a soldier was Nogami's apology to the Chinese

⁹² NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 353.

⁹³ NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 385.

people.⁹⁴

When Shōzō finds that the Chinese captive is to be executed and that he himself will most likely be chosen as the executioner, he has no doubt that if he does not set the captive free, Mariko would be very sad. In other words, he is supported and even encouraged by Mariko when he finally makes the decision to betray the Japanese Imperial army. By this decision, Shōzō finally can escape from his long labyrinth. He runs towards Yan'an with all his life, to return to communism.

The story ends at Count Eshima's residence on the night of the March 1945 air raid on Tokyo. Eshima's decision to court death by refusing to escape to the safe countryside is solid. He says to his mistress and servant of several decades, Tomi, to go anywhere she likes to avoid air raids because his decision is based only on his egoism. But she decides to stay with him because she cannot even imagine life without him. However, Tomi has never shown any resistance to Eshima since she started to serve him when she was sixteen, and she cries. This is an act of regaining her humanity and freedom as an individual. She cries loudly for the first time in front of her master. Eshima just stares at her. In Tomi's action he discovers that Tomi is a human being, not just one of his servants or possessions.⁹⁵ While talking with Tomi, Eshima for some reason remembers Shōzō and says to himself: "... if things go badly, a group around that young man may take over the nation after the war ..." ("Hakobune no hito", Chapter 6).⁹⁶ He and Tomi prepare for their death: "The two, though humbly, tried to live as a true husband and wife for the first time [in their lives], prior to being showered by bombs which fell on them as well as on the whole of Japan" ("Hakobune no hito", Chapter 6).⁹⁷ Katō Shūichi, a social and literary critic, said of *Meiro*: "This work is Hegelian, because every detail (particular) is made concrete by being conditioned by the time (the whole)".⁹⁸ The interplay of contrasts and the idea of individual freedom in *Meiro* are further

⁹⁴ NYZ I, suppl. 1, p. 299.

⁹⁵ I agree with Ōe Kenzaburō, when he writes in his 1985 essay that Nogami suggests Eshima's joy in loving for the first time another human being as a human being. Eshima is supported at his death by Tomi's love and his own, newly discovered love for Tomi. See "Kakushin sareta erosu", *Sekai*, No. 475 (June 1985), p. 323.

⁹⁶ NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 502.

⁹⁷ NYZ I, vol. 11, p. 503.

⁹⁸ *Asahi shinbun* (23 January 1976), see Diary entry of 24 January 1976, NYZ II, vol. 17(2), p.555.

developed and more focused in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, Nogami's next novel. I now turn to this work.

4.1 Introduction

Hideyoshi to Rikyū was completed in 1963, when Nogami was seventy-eight. Toyotomi Hideyoshi and Sen no Rikyū are historical figures from 16th century Japan. When Nogami was asked why she wanted to write about them, she answered that she knew of no other examples in Japanese history of such an encounter and relationship between a uniquely talented character and a superior artist. She said that it reminded her of the relationship between the Roman Emperor Nero (AD 37-68) and the writer Petronius Arbiter (died AD 66).¹ Nogami read about the latter relationship in Henryk Sienkiewicz's 1896 novel, *Quo Vadis*, which is about early Christians in Rome.²

Petronius Arbiter, a talented Roman writer, is believed to have written *Satyricon*,³ a description of life in the first century AD. He was referred to as *arbiter elegantiae* ("judge of elegance") by the Roman historian Tacitus, because of the taste of luxury and elegance in his work. Petronius planned many entertainments for Nero's court, and also served as proconsul and then consul. Nero's favoritism towards Petronius invited jealousy among those around Nero, especially the politician Otho Tigellinus (died AD 69), another of Nero's favourites. False accusations were brought against Petronius, who committed suicide in response to Nero's reckless anger. Before his death Petronius is said to have sent to Nero a written criticism of his tyranny. Not only the relationship between Nero and Petronius but also the cause of Petronius' death and his final criticism of Nero seem to have touched Nogami's literary imagination.

Hideyoshi to Rikyū is set between 1583 and 1591, the last three years of Sen no Rikyū's life. At that time Hideyoshi lived in Kyoto and was *taikō* (the imperial regent and grand minister of state), the head of the Japanese political hierarchy.

¹ A Polish writer who received the Nobel prize for literature in 1905.

² "Kamibutsu sōden", NTZ II, vol. 29, pp. 386-403.

³ *Satyricon* is a description of life in the 1st century AD. The most famous episode of the fragmentary work is Trimalchio's banquet, a realistic description of a banquet given by an ostentatious, newly rich freedman. *Satyricon* is said to have had a great influence on English literature. "Petronius Arbiter", *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Chapter 4 Hideyoshi to Rikyū

4.1 Introduction

Hideyoshi to Rikyū was completed in 1963, when Nogami was seventy-eight. Toyotomi Hideyoshi and Sen no Rikyū are historical figures from 16th century Japan. When Nogami was asked why she wanted to write about them, she answered that she knew of no other examples in Japanese history of such an encounter and relationship between a uniquely talented dictator and a superior artist. She said that it reminded her of the relationship between the Roman Emperor Nero (AD 37-68) and the writer Petronius Arbiter (died AD 66). Nogami read about the latter relationship in Henryk Sienkiewicz's¹ 1896 novel, *Quo Vadis*, which is about early Christians in Rome.²

Petronius Arbiter, a talented Roman writer, is believed to have written *Satyricon*,³ a description of life in the first century AD. He was referred to as Arbiter Elegantie ("judge of elegance") by the Roman historian Tacitus, because of the sense of luxury and elegance in his work. Petronius planned many entertainments for Nero's court, and also served as proconsul and then consul. Nero's favouritism towards Petronius invited jealousy among those around Nero, especially the politician Ofonius Tigellinus (died AD 69), another of Nero's favourite. False accusations were brought against Petronius, who committed suicide in response to Nero's resultant anger. Before his death Petronius is said to have sent to Nero a written criticism of his tyranny. Not only the relationship between Nero and Petronius but also the cause of Petronius' death and his final criticism of Nero seem to have touched Nogami's literary imagination.

Hideyoshi to Rikyū is set between 1588 and 1591, the last three years of Sen no Rikyū's life. At that time Hideyoshi lived in Kyoto and was *kanpaku dajō daijin* (the imperial regent and grand minister of state), the head of the Japanese political hierarchy.

¹ A Polish writer who received the Nobel prize for literature in 1905.

² "Karuizawa seidan", *NYZ II*, vol. 29, pp. 386-408.

³ *Satyricon* is a description of life in the 1st century AD. The most famous episode of the fragmentary work is Trimalchio's banquet, a realistic description of a banquet given by an ostentatious, newly rich freedman. *Satyricon* is said to have had a great influence on English literature. "Petronius Arbiter", *Microsoft (R) Encarta*.

Japan was then about to be united by Hideyoshi after a period of civil war. Rikyū, a wealthy merchant in Sakai,⁴ was Hideyoshi's top tea master, having gained his trust and favour. In March 1591, however, Rikyū committed *seppuku* (self-disembowelment) on Hideyoshi's instructions. *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* centres around an examination of why Hideyoshi demanded Rikyū's death. Historians have not produced a really convincing answer. Nogami fills this gap with an original, 'fictional' answer. *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* follows Rikyū through the last three years of his life, with fictional and non-fictional figures playing supporting roles.

In this chapter, I will first look briefly at the historical profiles of the two central figures.⁵ Secondly, I would like to discuss the influence of the development of Nogami's philosophical thought, particularly individualism, in terms of the relationship between *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* and *Meiro*. I also would like to look at the influence of Plato and *The Man Within*,⁶ one of Graham Greene's works, since Nogami understands there to be some similarity between Socrates and Rikyū, and Rikyū and the main character in Graham Greene's novel. Thirdly I will discuss the structure and plot of the novel, examining Nogami's patterns of conflict through the tension between the two principal characters, the national unifier and his tea master. I will also discuss Nogami's portrayal of the conflict within Rikyū himself between his love of power and his search for *wabi-cha*, the spirit of Rikyū's tea ceremony, before discussing his final victory over his "opportunism"⁷ and love of power. I will say more about *wabi-cha* in the course of the chapter.

⁴ A port city in Osaka Prefecture and a large trading town at that time.

⁵ In order to write the historical background, I consulted the following: Karaki Junzō, *Sen no Rikyū*; *Kokushi dai-jiten*; Kuwata Tadachika, *Sen no Rikyū kenkyū* (Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1976); Owada Tetsuo, *Toyotomi Hideyoshi* (Tokyo: Chuō kōronsha, 1985); R.H.P. Mason and J.G. Caiger, *A History of Japan* (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1973); Yonehara Masayoshi, *Sen no Rikyū* (Kyoto: Tankōsha, 1993).

⁶ Nogami read the Japanese translation, *Uchi naru watashi*. I could not read the original because it is out of print. My understanding of the book is based on the Japanese version.

⁷ In this chapter, I use "opportunism" to translate "*genjitsu-shugi*", the term used by Nogami to describe the tendency to put the maintenance of one's social position as one's first priority, regardless of doubts about its moral basis. I use "opportunist" to translate "*genjitsu-shugisha*".

4.1.1 Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536/1537-1598)

The early stage of Hideyoshi's life, before he turned twenty-eight, is unclear. He was said to be the son of a peasant farmer and/or *ashigaru* (a foot soldier) of Oda Nobuhide (1510-1551) in Owari Province (now part of Aichi Prefecture). If so, he enjoyed a unique career, rising from such a background to become the unifier of Japan. Later in life, when he had climbed to the top, he fabricated a story that he was the illegitimate son of a member of the imperial household, indicating a need to change his lower-class background to one more suitable to the imperial regent and national unifier.

In 1558 Hideyoshi became one of the servants of Oda Nobunaga (1534-1582), Nobuhide's son, who at that time was staking a claim to become the national unifier. Through his diligence and cleverness, Hideyoshi soon became Nobunaga's favourite vassal and seems to have been quickly promoted to higher ranks. Hideyoshi's name first appears in historical material in 1565, when it seems he was already a general of the house of Oda, though not yet a high ranking one.

In June 1582 Akechi Mitsuhide, another of Oda's generals, assassinated his lord Nobunaga in the so-called the Honnōji Incident. Hideyoshi, acting more quickly than any other general in the house, attacked Mitsuhide a few weeks later and killed him in the battle of Yamazaki. (Hideyoshi commissioned many Noh plays about his successes. *Akechi Uchi*, based on this battle, was one of them. Rikyū's attitude towards *Akechi Uchi* is one of the key elements of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*.) This greatly strengthened Hideyoshi's position. After cleverly negotiating his way through a series of power struggles, Hideyoshi practically became Nobunaga's successor in the same year. By the end of 1585, after victories in several battles against other high ranking generals of the house, Hideyoshi was appointed *kanpaku* (the imperial regent). The following year he was made *dajō daijin* (the grand minister of state). He was delegated full civil and military powers by the emperor. The remaining parts of Japan to conquer were Kyushu, the north-east of Kanto and Tohoku. These soon fell under Hideyoshi's control. Kyushu was taken in 1587, the Kanto in 1590 and Tohoku in 1591. Hideyoshi thus unified Japan and established a new political hierarchy.

In 1585, just after he became *kanpaku*, Hideyoshi developed a plan to invade China and Korea. Hideyoshi had already fabricated his claim to be the son of a member

of the imperial family. This fabrication grew into another, with Hideyoshi declaring himself to be the son of the Sun God. Consequently, Hideyoshi seems to have thought that his glory should not be limited to Japan but should be expanded to China. Hideyoshi also wanted to reopen trade with Ming China. There was another political reason for this attempt at overseas expansion. When Hideyoshi finally unified Japan, there were still a few powerful daimyos, such as Tokugawa Ieyasu, whom Hideyoshi and his entourage could not entirely trust. In order to control them, Hideyoshi had to prevent them from building their military power. The war against China and Korea was thought to be a good opportunity to make them spend their money and weaken their military power. The first expedition was in 1592, the second 1597. Both were unsuccessful. Lacking proper information about China and Korea, Hideyoshi and his advisers blindly overestimated Japan's power. (The Japanese forces actually did not reach China. They first attacked Korea but were repeatedly pushed back.) The plan was abandoned with Hideyoshi's death in 1598. According to Nogami, it was Rikyū's criticism of this plan which lay behind his *seppuku* in 1591.

During his reign Hideyoshi built three notable castles: Osaka Castle in 1583, Jurakudai in Kyoto in 1588, and Fushimi Castle near Kyoto in 1594. Jurakudai forms the luxurious setting for most of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. The plan for Fushimi Castle, for which, according to Nogami, Hideyoshi wanted to solicit Rikyū's ideas, had to be prepared without Rikyū because of his death, and the absence of Rikyū for this project reminded Hideyoshi how indispensable he had become.

In his final years Hideyoshi seems to have become very unstable, suspicious, hot-tempered and blind with love for his infant son Hideyori (1593-1615). Hideyori was his second natural son, although he had many adopted children. (His first natural son, Tsurumatsu, died of illness in 1591, soon after Rikyū died, and the second son was born two years later.) This second son became Hideyoshi's only interest. He made a desperate death-bed plea to the Five Great Elders, his top generals, to take care of his son. (Many historians see senility in Hideyoshi's old age, particularly in this behaviour: some see evidence of the disease as early as the Rikyū incident.) However, Hideyori committed suicide with his mother in 1615, seventeen years after Hideyoshi's death, when his status was reduced to that of one daimyo among many by Tokugawa Ieyasu, one of Hideyoshi's former Five Great Elders. Tokugawa Ieyasu had by then founded the Tokugawa

shogunate, which was to last more than two and a half centuries until the Meiji Restoration in 1868.

4.1.2 Sen no Rikyū (1522-1591)

Sen no Rikyū is known to us as a great tea master of the Azuchi-Momoyama period (1573-1600) and the founder of the *Sen-ke* Tea Ceremony. He was born as the son of a wealthy wholesale fish dealer in Sakai in Izumi Province (now part of Osaka Prefecture), and the Sen family belonged to a group of wealthy merchants who formed a virtually autonomous city government.⁸ Sakai, a prosperous port that traded with Ming China in the Muromachi period (1392-1573), was then still a thriving city and the centre of the Japanese economy. Rikyū grew up in this free, urban atmosphere.

In his youth Rikyū had learnt *chanoyu* (the tea ceremony), a very important social pastime in Japanese society⁹ as well as an art offering the challenge of self-discipline. He had learnt first *shoin-no-cha*¹⁰ from Kitamuki Dōchin (1504-1562) and then *wabi-cha* from Takeno Jōō (1502-1555). *Wabi-cha* is said to have been initiated by Murata Jukō (1422-1502), developed by Takeno Jōō, and completed by Rikyū. Takeno Jōō was the tea master who united Zen and *chanoyu* because of his belief that *chanoyu* was an outcome of Zen. Rikyū also studied Zen, and later was deeply involved in Zen study at Daitokuji.¹¹ It seems that by 1555, when he was thirty-three, Rikyū was already a famous tea master.

⁸ Nogami compares the wealthy merchants in the Sakai of the time with Nikkeiren, the Japanese Federation of Employers' Associations. See "Tenka-nin no Jōken", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 111.

⁹ The tea ceremony was a very expensive hobby that involved, not only learning it but also collecting famous utensils from all over Japan, Korea and China. Only wealthy people could afford it, and inevitably it had a strongly ostentatious aspect. Many wealthy people learnt the tea ceremony not only for their own cultivation but also to demonstrate their wealth, even before the tea ceremony gained political meaning.

¹⁰ A style of tea ceremony which spread widely in the Muromachi period, before *wabi-cha* was introduced. *Shoin-no-cha* represents a noble and elegant tea ceremony, performed in a large and ornately decorated room.

¹¹ A major Rinzai Zen temple in Kyoto. In Rikyū's time, a centre for the development of artistic culture. See *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 8, p. 811.

Rikyū's teacher Takeno Jōō summed up his *wabi-cha*, after which, according to Nogami, Rikyū was seeking,¹² with three words: "*kare, kajikete, samukare* (be withered, emaciated, cold)". This means that, in contrast with *shoin-no-cha*, the performance of *wabi-cha* avoids ornamental display and anything ostentatious, decorative, or exuberant. One's actions are kept to an absolute minimum. Rikyū's *wabi-cha*, or the aesthetics of *wabi*, is the beauty that conceals abundant life behind its poor appearance, which has no material value but great inner depth, and is not lifelessly artificial. Rikyū created many things, including a much smaller room made of grass and mud for the tea ceremony,¹³ to convey the simplicity of *wabi-cha*.

When Oda Nobunaga came to control Sakai, Rikyū became his tea master, along with other well-known Sakai tea masters. This was in 1570, when Rikyū was forty-eight. At that time having good tea masters, necessary for important meetings and other events, was a sign of a feudal lord's power. Nogami writes of this time: "For men nowadays the tea [ceremony] is a means of training, a basic practice, a tool of socialising and therefore of politics" (Chapter 16).¹⁴ Tea masters often had to sit through secret and tense meetings involving their lords, and as a consequence often had knowledge of high-level political secrets. This gave them political strength and sometimes made them political advisors. Since Hideyoshi's tea masters were wealthy merchants, there was not only a political but also an economic purpose for retaining them. Although Rikyū was already famous as a great tea master, it seems that he was third in rank in the house of Oda after two other masters from Sakai.

The merchants of Sakai traditionally took pride in their freedom and independence from political power, a power whose exercise they often disdained. Nogami describes the situation: "For the spirit of genuine merchants of the free city of Sakai, [the life of a] samurai or daimyo meant, in the end, the terrible business of attacking and killing each other" (Chapter 3).¹⁵ The merchants saw themselves as the centre of the economy, the sphere where wealth was created rather than destroyed.

¹² See the chapters 11 and 12 in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, NYZ I, vol. 13.

¹³ The Myōki tea room in Yamazaki. This tea room, one of Rikyū's creations, represents the simplicity of *wabi-cha*. Until this tea room was built, the size of tea rooms was generally 2.7 x 2.7 square meters (4½ tatami mats) or even bigger, but the Myōki tea room was only 1.8 x 1.8 square meters (2 tatami mats). Karaki, *Sen no Rikyū*, pp. 58-74.

¹⁴ NYZ I, vol. 13, pp. 321-322.

When Rikyū first met Hideyoshi, the latter was a low-ranking general under Nobunaga and Rikyū a highly ranked tea master. Rikyū's position was therefore higher than Hideyoshi's in the house of Oda. However, after Nobunaga was assassinated in 1582 and Hideyoshi became his successor, Rikyū became Hideyoshi's retained tea master. Their relationship was reversed. This was in 1583, when Rikyū was sixty-one and Hideyoshi forty-seven.

Rikyū soon gained Hideyoshi's trust and favour because of his unique and versatile talent, and became not only Hideyoshi's top tea master but also an important advisor. Rikyū seems to have enjoyed a glorious period of several years as the supreme national tea master and the closest advisor to the national unifier. This fact is said to have invited jealousy from other advisors, a jealousy which in all likelihood played a major role in Rikyū's death. Rikyū's glory came to an abrupt and dramatic end on the 28th of February 1591, when he was ordered by Hideyoshi to commit *seppuku*, a legal and common method of execution among samurai at that time. Rikyū's severed head was left on the edge of a bridge, unburied, and a wooden sculpture of him¹⁶ was crucified, symbols not only of death but of utter disgrace.

4.1.3 The mystery of Rikyū's death

Several theories have been put forward to explain Rikyū's *seppuku*.¹⁷ Karaki's *Sen no Rikyū*, which Nogami used as material for her literary imagination along with other historical materials, approached this question by trying to reconstruct Hideyoshi's explanation for this action. No document giving Hideyoshi's explanation of Rikyū's death has survived.

The first suggestion is that Rikyū had had a wooden sculpture of himself placed in the *sanmon*, a structural addition to the main gate of the Daitoku temple, under which Hideyoshi and others walked.¹⁸ It is said that Hideyoshi was furious that Rikyū put

¹⁵ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 272.

¹⁶ This sculpture, according to Nogami, was a gift from Daitokuji to Rikyū to commemorate his donation of the money to renovate Daitokuji's main gate (*sanmon*).

¹⁷ Yonehara, *Sen no Rikyū*, pp. 264-270. Yonehara collected twelve explanations of Rikyū's death.

¹⁸ Nogami held that since this sculpture was a gift from Daitokuji to honour the donor Rikyū, it was not his decision where it was placed.

himself, even in the form of a wooden sculpture, above Hideyoshi. This happened in 1590, about a year before Rikyū's death, at a time when Hideyoshi thought of himself (and wanted others to think of him) as the son of the Sun God.¹⁹ This theory seems quite plausible.²⁰

Another theory is that Rikyū made large illegal profits by selling tea bowls and other utensils for the tea ceremony, thereby abusing his position as the top tea master of the national unifier. This may well have been true. Rikyū was a merchant as well as an artist. But he had been doing this for many years. Therefore, although this could have been used as part of the official explanation for Rikyū's death, it is hardly convincing as a reason for Hideyoshi's change of attitude.²¹

Historians generally agree that these two reasons are the most likely candidates for what was set down as the reason for Rikyū's punishment in a notice (no longer extant) next to Rikyū's severed head.²² However, most historians still find them unconvincing as the real reasons, and Rikyū's exalted status within Japanese cultural history ensures that the search for a better explanation continues. (There is another well-known theory which spread during the Edo period. This is that Rikyū refused Hideyoshi's request to give his daughter as one of Hideyoshi's concubines, and his refusal caused Hideyoshi's anger. But according to Karaki, this happened in 1589, and therefore can hardly be the explanation for Rikyū's sudden fall in 1591.)²³

This mystery seems to have ignited Nogami's literary imagination. She agreed with Karaki that deeper, more complex reasons are needed to explain Rikyū's *seppuku*.²⁴ In *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, Nogami gives her own account of what these reasons might have been. She suggests that the immediate reason was Rikyū's casual words expressing doubt about the success of Hideyoshi's plan to invade China and Korea. In the novel,

¹⁹ Owada, *Toyotomi Hideyoshi*, p. 153.

²⁰ Yonehara, *Sen no Rikyū*, p. 271.

²¹ Karaki, *Sen no Rikyū*, p. 119-121.

²² According to *Kokushi dai-jiten*, these two were definitely the official reasons. The placement of such a notice was a common method at the time of publicising the reasons for punishment.

²³ See Karaki, *Sen no Rikyū*, p. 119 and *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 8, p. 482.

²⁴ Karaki, *Sen no Rikyū*, pp. 121-122. This view is also supported by other historians. See also Kuwata, *Sen no Rikyū kenkyū*, pp. 232-254, Yonehara, *Sen no Rikyū*, pp. 249-272 and "Sen no Rikyū", *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 8, p. 482.

this comment by Rikyū is used by certain magistrates, who hate Rikyū because of his successful role as Hideyoshi's closest advisor, to bring about Rikyū's fall. Rikyū remarks to his brother-in-law (a fictional figure), a Noh actor, that conquering China would not be as easy as performing the Noh play *Akechi Uchi*, which Hideyoshi commissioned and in which he played himself in the main, heroic role. Destroying Akechi Mitsuhide was certainly the turning point in Hideyoshi's career. Nogami develops the whole novel around this point, using her storytelling skills to show convincingly there can be no other reason for Rikyū's death.²⁵

4.2 *Meiro*, books and studies influencing *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*

Because of its historical nature, *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, unlike *Meiro*, does not have characters developed from those that appear in previous novels. However, there is a strong connection between *Meiro*, *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* and *Mori*, Nogami's next and last novel. Certain ideas which Nogami nurtured in *Meiro*, particularly individual freedom, are further developed and more focused in this novel. The patterns of conflict involve fewer relationships. In *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* Nogami approaches her fundamental ideas from another perspective.

In this section I will discuss firstly the relationship between *Meiro* and *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. I then will look at the influence of books, both philosophical and fictional, which Nogami read by herself or with the philosopher Tanabe Hajime, before and during the time she wrote *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. I would like particularly to look at their influence on the shift in Nogami's theme from the conflict between Hideyoshi and Rikyū to the conflict within Rikyū.

4.2.1 *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* in relation to *Meiro*

In my view, the most important theme in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* is the meaning of personal integrity, in the sense of living according to principles independently validated. In this respect I see *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* as a further development of Nogami's presentation of individual freedom in *Meiro*. In *Meiro*, the principal contrast is between Marxist

²⁵ Nogami's view seems to have gained a lot of general support. Yonehara, *Sen no Rikyū*, p. 266.

"humanism" and fascism, while in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, the contrast is between individual freedom based on the spirit of *wabi-cha* (Zen) and craven "opportunism" and love of power.

As noted in the Introduction, individualism is an idea borrowed from the West. The Japanese concept of "individualism" (*kojin-shugi*) usually does not convey the positive meanings associated with the term in Western society, but carries strong overtones of selfishness. However, Nogami's use of the concept shows the influence of its Western meaning, ie. an understanding of the individual as the bearer of rights and responsibilities, not as a part of social or national groups, or of any overarching power. This conception of individualism is evident in *Meiro*. In *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, Nogami seems to want to take individualism to a deeper level. Nogami's Rikyū achieves true individual freedom as a seeker of *wabi-cha* by going through a much more radical change than the main character in *Meiro*. Rikyū goes from a wielder of magnificent power to the status of criminal, from the object of people's praise and envy to complete disgrace, and this provides him at the same time with the opportunity to leap from being a ruled and retained servant to being a free-spirited and independent artist. For this leap, Rikyū relies on no one but himself. He does not need any help apart from his own philosophy, the spirit of Zen, to come to the end of his struggle and reach the summit of his 'selfless ambition'.

In his 1914 essay "Watashi no kojīn-shugi",²⁶ Natsume Sōseki talks about his conception of individualism. In this essay (originally given as a talk to students), Sōseki introduces the Western individualism which he learnt when he was in England from 1900 to 1903,²⁷ although he seems to have had little time for the women's liberation movement which was then appearing, despite its deep relation with the idea of individualism. Emphasising the importance of individual freedom for one's personal development, he stresses that if one wants to develop individual freedom, one has to respect the freedom of others. For Sōseki, individualism necessarily involves respecting others' existence as well as one's own. I see here the influence of John Stuart Mill's conception of individualism. This is very different from the Japanese idea, and indeed Sōseki was one of the first to introduce Western individualism to Japan. As I noted in the previous chapter, there

²⁶ Natsume Sōseki, "Watashi no kojīn-shugi", *Natsume Sōseki zenshū* (10 vols., 1 suppl.), (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1972), vol. 10, pp. 122-140.

²⁷ Although he shows some dislike towards England in this essay, Sōseki admired the social and individual sense of freedom coupled with duty that he found there.

was a strong current of patriotic nationalism in Japan when Sōseki gave this talk.²⁸ It must not have been an easy task to introduce western individualism in such circumstances.

It is not hard to imagine Sōseki's idea of individualism having a strong impact on his disciples, including Nogami, who was beginning her career as a writer at around the time this speech was made. Indeed, this influence seems to have carried on throughout Nogami's life.

Nogami says in the 1965 interview "Joryū-bungaku to sakka seikatsu" that her study of philosophy with Tanabe was her prime reason for writing *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, although she had been interested in the relationship between Hideyoshi and Rikyū since reading Sienkiewicz's *Quo Vadis*.²⁹ She says she learned the analytical method of thinking about human reality from the study of philosophy.³⁰ When you look at the patterns of conflict in *Meiro*, each conflicting idea is represented basically by different individuals and groups. The two main conflicts in the novel are between (i) two ideals, fascism and "humanism" and (ii) the state and the individual,³¹ a division which ran through Japanese intellectual life at the time. In *Meiro*, Nogami questions how individuals should live in given social and historical circumstances. In *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, there is a similar conflict, represented by each of the main characters. However, later in the book the question addressed in *Meiro* is thrown back to the individual. It then becomes: How should one live regardless of circumstances? How can one find inner strength to live according to principle? Is such a life worth the effort? Nogami answers these questions positively through the resolution of Rikyū's life, through his realisation of his own individual freedom and the consequent decision to follow the principle of his life. Rikyū's was a long, difficult and painful journey. He, like the main character of *Meiro*, had to come through a long labyrinth to reach what he was truly seeking.

²⁸ Section 3.1.1, "Brief look at the political and social situation in Japan prior to 1930".

²⁹ In the discussion "Karuizawa seidan", Nogami said that she had been thinking of the comparison between the relationships in *Quo Vadis* and Hideyoshi and Rikyū for a long time, but did not have the courage to write about it until she read Karaki's *Sen no Rikyū*. See NYZ II, vol. 29, p. 393.

³⁰ NYZ I, suppl. 2, p. 89.

³¹ Section 3.3.1, "Fascism and 'humanism'".

4.2.2 *The Apology, The Republic and The Man Within*

According to her diary, Nogami read Plato's *Apology* while developing the idea of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. She wrote in her diary entry of 30 June 1958 that she realised that various thoughts uttered by Socrates during his trial could be used for the novel. She also mentioned similarities between the ages of Socrates and Rikyū (both were seventy when they died) and their thoughts at the end of their lives, with both finding it impossible to live further by renouncing their beliefs.³² Socrates' acceptance of impending death during his trial seems to have suggested to Nogami to have Rikyū decline the chance of survival offered by apologising to Hideyoshi³³ at the end of the novel. Socrates says to the jury:

You would have liked to hear me weep and wail, doing and saying all sorts of things which I regard as unworthy of myself, but which you are used to hearing from other people. But I did not think then that I ought to stoop to servility because I was in danger, and I would much rather die as the result of this defence than live as the result of the other sort ... as soon as I am dead, vengeance shall fall upon you with a punishment far more painful than your killing of me. (38d - e and 39c)³⁴

Socrates continues in terms entirely applicable to Nogami's Rikyū:

You too, gentlemen of the jury, must look forward to death with confidence, and fix your minds on this one belief, which is certain - that nothing can harm a good man either in life or after death, and his fortunes are not a matter of indifference to the gods ... I am quite clear that the time had come when it was better for me to die and be released from my distractions. (41c - d)³⁵

According to Nogami's diaries, she studied Plato's *Republic* with Tanabe while writing the early part (the first quarter) of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. It is not hard to imagine that she was influenced by Tanabe,³⁶ who admired Socrates. In his *Jitsuzon to ai to jissen*, Tanabe writes that Socrates was a great teacher, who completed his teaching of

³² NYZ II, vol. 13, p. 319.

³³ This is Nogami's Rikyū. There is no historical evidence supporting this view.

³⁴ Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, ed., *The Collected Dialogues Of Plato* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961), pp. 23-24. All quotes from Plato are from this book.

³⁵ Hamilton and Cairns, *The Collected Dialogues Of Plato*, pp. 25-26.

³⁶ Tanabe became ill and died before the novel was completed.

life and death, death in particular, with his heroic end.³⁷ For Nogami, both Socrates and Rikyū completed whatever they were teaching through out their lives by the way they died, both choosing death rather than life based on compromised beliefs. One can well imagine Nogami's Rikyū, prior to finally committing *seppuku*, mentally addressing Hideyoshi with Socrates' words at the end of *The Apology* to Hideyoshi: "Now it is time that we were going, I to die and you to live, but which of us has the happier prospect is unknown to anyone but God" (42a).³⁸

Francis Cornford writes in the Introduction to his translation of *The Republic*: "The main question to be answered in *The Republic* is: What does Justice mean, and how can it be realised in human society?"³⁹ He also refers to Socrates' fundamental question: how ought we to live? These fundamental questions seem to have kept developing through Nogami's life. She had a strong moral and ethical sense in both personal and social/political issues. This tendency was in all likelihood further encouraged by Tanabe, whom Nogami loved and respected. Nogami's continually deepening interest in basic ethical questions is emphasised by the Japanese contemporary writer and Nobel prize winner, Ōe Kenzaburō, who writes that it is those (and he here includes himself) inclined to reflect on the ethical dimensions of their own lives who are attracted to Nogami's writing.⁴⁰

Nogami also read Graham Greene's 1929 novel, *The Man Within*, when she was writing the early part of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, and she wrote in her diary that she got many good suggestions from this novel.⁴¹ The setting of *The Man Within* is early nineteenth century England. The main character is a young man who is running away from a group of alcohol smugglers to which he belonged until he betrayed the others to the authorities. The reason for this betrayal is to escape from the group that confirmed him as "weak and

³⁷ The relevant article was written in 1947. See Tanabe Hajime, *Tanabe Hajime zenshū*, vol. 9 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963-1964), p. 413.

³⁸ Hamilton and Cairns, *The Collected Dialogues Of Plato*, p.26.

³⁹ Francis M. Cornford, *The Republic Of Plato* (London, Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 1.

⁴⁰ Ōe Kenzaburō, "Ōinaru imōto no chikara", *Shincho*, 81:6 (Tokyo: June 1984), p. 256 and "Hontō ni chiteki na ikikata".

⁴¹ Diary entry of 27 March 1962, *NYZ II*, vol. 14, p. 193. Nogami also read in translation Greene's novel *Moetsukita ningen* (*A Burnt-out Case*, 1961) at around the same time and admired Greene's ability as a novelist.

cowered". His father was the leader of the group until he died. The members expect the son to be like his fearsome and courageous father, but he hates his father and sees himself as a weak pup spawned by a mighty bear.

The young man has multiple aspects to his personality - bravery, cowardice and cunning - that are in conflict with each other. He finally overcomes his fear of physical pain and weakness of will through his love for a girl. He completes his life by a decision to kill himself after he no longer sees himself as a weak man. In this character, I see elements of Rikyū and Kisaburō, Rikyū's third son (a fictional figure), for Rikyū also was marked by conflicting aspects in his personality, while Kisaburō, who is actually presented as another aspect of Rikyū, had to struggle to escape from his father's glorious shadow.

What is the crucial idea that Nogami got from both Plato and Greene for *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*? In my view, it is a clear focus on Rikyū as an individual, rather than on the conflict between the two main characters. It is hard to know at what point Nogami's interest moved from the relationship between the two title figures to Rikyū's inner struggle. It seems to have been a gradual shift. However, in her letter of 28 August 1961 to Fujita Yoshio of *Chūō kōron*,⁴² Nogami writes that the young man Kisaburō is second in importance among the novel's characters only to Rikyū.⁴³ If Hideyoshi is no longer the second character, and his place is taken by a character who is another aspect of Rikyū, this suggests that in Nogami's mind the focus had shifted to tensions within Rikyū. At this time Nogami was writing Chapter 10, midway through the novel.⁴⁴

4.3 The structure and plot of the novel and its conflictual patterns

A set of dichotomies is again well used in this novel, and the treatment is better focused than in *Meiro*. Nogami had for a long time wanted to write a historical novel about the Christian daimyo Ōtomo Sōrin,⁴⁵ but she chose instead to write about Hideyoshi and Rikyū. Despite Natsume Sōseki's long standing advice not to write a historical

⁴² *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* was published in the magazine *Chūō kōron* from January 1962. Fujita was in charge of the novel's publication.

⁴³ Letter 1104, *NYZ II*, vol. 26, p. 106.

⁴⁴ Diary entries of 2 and 27 August 1961, *NYZ II*, vol. 14, pp. 91 and 108.

⁴⁵ See above, section 2.2, "Usuki and its historical background".

novel,⁴⁶ apparently considering it too difficult to maintain historical accuracy while pursuing artistic aims, the relationship between Hideyoshi and Rikyū was too attractive for Nogami's literary imagination to resist. In my view, their conflictual relationship was wonderfully suited to Nogami's need to give concrete expression to the dialectical thinking in which she had become very interested through her study with Tanabe. Although the importance of dialectics in the philosophical sense in the detail of the novel is unclear and questionable, Nogami's interest in dialectics seems to have been a determining factor in her decision to write about Hideyoshi and Rikyū.

In one sense the method of writing is the same as in Nogami's other novels. She again acts like an omniscient God, moving her characters at will, writing principally in the third person. However, the historical nature of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* meant that Nogami had to follow the known events surrounding the two main figures as closely as possible. Her knowledge and understanding of the historical facts is detailed and deep. But *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* is fiction, not history. The historical 'facts' are important as material for Nogami's literary imagination, and it is the latter with which I am principally concerned.

From the first chapter Nogami conveys the mental conflicts underlying the relationship between Hideyoshi and Rikyū: Rikyū's ambivalence about his position (his struggle with the jealousy of other members of the house of Toyotomi and his conflicting wishes both to continue to exercise political power and to reach the summit of *wabi-cha*) is mirrored by Hideyoshi's love-hate relationship with him. Nogami leads the reader towards the well-known climax, Rikyū's *seppuku* under Hideyoshi's orders, revealing her explanation of Rikyū's death convincingly with her usual intricate writing style - piling up details, fictional and non-fictional, the latter the result of thorough research, to create a compelling reality.⁴⁷

Nogami seems to be on Rikyū's side. Her understanding of and sympathy for Rikyū are clear from the beginning. In Rikyū's refusal to escape death by apologising to Hideyoshi, Nogami expresses his victory as an artist filled with the spirit of *wabi-cha*.

⁴⁶ "Ryokuin kanwa", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 217.

⁴⁷ Nogami writes in a letter: "[This novel, *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*] is, of course, fiction but the base has to be built on reality. A fiction built on reality becomes the most realistic [story]. I think this is the right way". Letter 1036, *NYZ II*, vol. 26, p. 39.

over his desire for political and social success and material possessions. She wrote in her diary entry of 5 April 1967, about four years after the completion of the novel:

By his death, Rikyū triumphed not only over Hideyoshi's power, but also over the "opportunism" of his [Rikyū's] own mind. In other words, he conquered himself, and there is a deeper meaning in this ... I should have placed more emphasis on this point in the last chapter of that work.⁴⁸

Nogami develops the story to support her view of the true cause of Rikyū's death by referring not only to political circumstances but also to aspects of Rikyū's psychology. Nogami says that she started to write *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* with the aim of describing the unique relationship between the two protagonists. Now I would like to examine the story and plot, together with the novel's conflictual patterns.

4.3.1 Sophisticated urban artist vs. peasant risen to power

The story begins with Rikyū relaxing at his Sakai residence, away from Hideyoshi. Rikyū has another residence at the site of Jurakudai in Kyoto, but there he is never free from Hideyoshi.

Hideyoshi has already come to power, and the main tea masters of Sakai have all been called to serve him - for *chanoyu* is not just an art, a refined practice of high society. It is a symbol of power or of the ruler's self satisfaction as a *suki-sha* (a man of refined taste) and also an instrument of politics. Rikyū's family is well cultivated, wealthy and urban, while Hideyoshi is a parvenu from the countryside, from a background unconnected with cultivation or wealth. This fact dominates Hideyoshi's attitude towards Rikyū, especially after he has gained power.

The reason Rikyū stays as Hideyoshi's tea master is his love of power and of the achievements that only Hideyoshi's wealth can make possible. While reasonably wealthy in his own right, Rikyū needs the enormous wealth that Hideyoshi has at his disposal. Without it Rikyū's talent and ideas could not have taken visible form and may well have finished a mere dream. He definitely could not have had the golden tea room,⁴⁹ although

⁴⁸ NYZ II, vol. 16, p. 62.

⁴⁹ Hideyoshi's demountable tea room, in which the wooden surfaces were covered with gold and the utensils used were all made of gold (the floor was red wool and the windows red silk). It was first used in the imperial palace in Kyoto in 1586, and seems later to have been moved to Hideyoshi's Osaka

this room does not mean as much to Rikyū as a symbol of wealth and power as it does to Hideyoshi.⁵⁰ To Rikyū, a seeker after harmony between extreme luxury and poverty, the golden tea room represents just one side of this dichotomy.

Rikyū, as a "opportunist", coaxes and cajoles Hideyoshi in order to be able to put his ideas into practice. Rikyū knows very well what he is doing. At the same time he also appreciates Hideyoshi's rare talent, his intelligence and his resourcefulness as a conqueror. However, Rikyū's gratitude and praise for Hideyoshi, although real, are not pure. In the depth of these positive appreciations, there is reproach. In Rikyū's mind there are conflicting feelings towards Hideyoshi. Nogami writes: "Gratitude and defiance, respect and reproach co-existed as different sides of the same coin" (Chapter 1).⁵¹ This defiance and reproach towards power are based not only on Rikyū's artistic spirit but also on the traditional nature of the free city, Sakai, where autonomy is a vital element of the life of the people. The gap between Rikyū's sophistication and Hideyoshi's rusticity is well described in a scene in which Hideyoshi, using coarse language, vilifies Rikyū. Nogami adds:

Rikyū, as a typical urban dweller of Sakai, grew up sensitive to language. One of the secrets of Rikyū's heart, his condescension towards Hideyoshi as a rural dweller, was based on this disgrace which included Hideyoshi's uncouth speech, which Rikyū hated to hear. (Chapter 20)⁵²

Rikyū's ambivalence towards Hideyoshi seems to be mirrored by Hideyoshi's ambivalence towards Rikyū. While Hideyoshi loves and trusts Rikyū and thinks of him as indispensable (Nogami's descriptions of Hideyoshi's concern for Rikyū during the latter's sickness are detailed and convincing), in some region of Hideyoshi's mind there is also hate for Rikyū. After Hideyoshi has become the national unifier and possesses everything he wants - power, wealth, reputation, material goods - only Rikyū remains as an existence which makes him feel small and unsure of himself, thereby casting a shadow over his glory. Describing this complicated relationship further, Nogami writes: "Rikyū knew this feeling of Hideyoshi. Hideyoshi knew that Rikyū knew it and Rikyū knew that

Castle. See Kuwata, *Sen no Rikyū kenkyū*, pp. 121-145 and *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 4, p. 689.

⁵⁰ In her *Nogami Yaeko*, Sakasai writes that Nogami believes, in contrast to the majority of historians, that the golden tea room had a positive meaning for Rikyū. Sakasai, *Nogami Yaeko*, pp. 270-271.

⁵¹ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 26.

⁵² NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 401.

[his knowledge] was known to Hideyoshi" (Chapter 1).⁵³

4.3.2 Rikyū's enemy and ally

Besides Hideyoshi's hidden and complex hatred, Rikyū has another enemy in the house of Toyotomi, Ishida Mitsunari. Ishida is the top magistrate among Hideyoshi's advisors. Nogami takes several lines (quoted above in Section 2.3) to describe his appearance. He is a typically cold hearted and inflexible bureaucrat. Nogami explains his hatred of Rikyū:

His [Ishida's] bureaucratic nature demands that he himself and others be strictly faithful to their duties ... his secret hatred of Rikyū was rooted [in this nature]. The point was that Rikyū did not remain just a tea master [like other tea masters]. (Chapter 3)⁵⁴

Ishida is a person who is always looking for, or even trying to plot, Rikyū's fall, because Rikyū does not fit into his map of the hierarchy. While Ishida tries to hide his animosity behind an outwardly friendly and polite manner, his true feelings are no secret to Rikyū. When Ishida hears about the wooden sculpture of Rikyū in the *sanmon* of Daitokuji, he anxiously waits for the best opportunity to have Rikyū expelled from the hierarchy.

Rikyū, on the other hand, has a strong ally in Toyotomi Hidenaga, Hideyoshi's younger brother, whom Hideyoshi truly loves and trusts. Unlike his elder brother Hidenaga is a calm and thoughtful person, who trusts Rikyū more purely than does Hideyoshi. Hidenaga seems to have kept a close relationship with Rikyū, and if he had lived longer (Hidenaga died of tuberculosis in January 1591, shortly before Rikyū's death) Rikyū would not have died the way he did. Nogami writes of Hidenaga:

It was perhaps only Hidenaga who [could] see through the conflict in the relation of two exceptionally superior talents. [In the conflict] the sharp edges of [the two] swords might occasionally strike each other, despite the [deep] admiration, trust and respect between his elder brother and the supreme tea master. (Chapter 2)⁵⁵

⁵³ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 33.

⁵⁴ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 102.

⁵⁵ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 58.

Hiddenaga sees himself as the person in charge of the official half of the house of Toyotomi, while Rikyū looks after the other unofficial half. Together they maintain the strength of the house of Toyotomi. Hiddenaga fully appreciates Rikyū's nature:

Hiddenaga, more than anyone else, always highly appreciated Rikyū's scrupulous discernment, his attention to detail and a resourcefulness which never failed to complete any task, and regretted keeping him as [only] a tea master... (Chapter 6)⁵⁶

Rikyū never allowed his personal consideration [to intrude] into important matters and showed unerring, bright intelligence in judging right from wrong. The reason why Hideyoshi valued Rikyū as more than a tea master, and the reason why his brother Hiddenaga saw Rikyū as indispensable, was based on this fact. (Chapter 8)⁵⁷

4.3.3 Contradiction within Rikyū

Rikyū's third son, Kisaburō (the most important purely fictional character Nogami created in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*), provides deep insights into Rikyū's mind.⁵⁸ Nogami writes:

This son [Kisaburō] questioned his father about things no one else did, even when he was sitting silently. Even when he was not beside [Rikyū], he was always watching his father in a way no one else did, and in a way Rikyū never wanted to be watched. Rikyū clearly felt this. (Chapter 9)⁵⁹

When Takayama Ukon (1552-1615), a Christian daimyo and one of Rikyū's Seven Great Disciples, is condemned to exile and deprived of his fiefdom in 1587 by the Anti-Christian Edicts⁶⁰ declared by Hideyoshi, Kisaburō asks for details of what Rikyū did to rescue his disciple. Rikyū answers that it is not wise to criticise the decision of the

⁵⁶ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 165.

⁵⁷ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 189.

⁵⁸ Diary entry of 29 October 1960, NYZ II, vol. 13, p. 689.

⁵⁹ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 198.

⁶⁰ An 11-point edict prohibiting forced conversion and denouncing Christianity. Takayama and his family were expelled to Manila by the Tokugawa shogunate in 1614 because he did not repudiate his Christian belief, and he died there in 1615.

authorities (Chapter 3).⁶¹ Even when Rikyū's close friend and Zen teacher, the monk Kokei,⁶² is condemned to exile unjustly, Rikyū again keeps his silence (Chapter 5).⁶³ Nogami describes rumours which Kisaburō hears:

He [Rikyū] is a man who shines by the glory of the *kanpaku* [the imperial regent, Hideyoshi], who is dependent on gifts and more dependent on money. It would be harsh to take these words as they are, but they are too real to treat as lies. (Chapter 5)⁶⁴

The above description identifies one of the aspects of Rikyū's character. When Rikyū thinks of Kisaburō, the latter's image is sometimes superimposed on that of one of Rikyū's top disciples, Yamanoue Sōji (1544-1590). Yamanoue is killed by Hideyoshi less than a year before Rikyū,⁶⁵ because of his refusal to abide by Hideyoshi's requirement to return from exile in order to serve Hideyoshi again as a tea master. Through his refusal Yamanoue questions Rikyū's "opportunism" and highlights Rikyū's illusion that he could pursue his 'selfless ambition' while remaining a political confidant of the national unifier. Despite his indubitable love and respect for his master, Yamanoue Sōji also knows Rikyū's self-deception and can never understand why Rikyū, such a tireless seeker after *wabi-cha*, can be so close to political power.⁶⁶ Nogami writes: "He [Sōji] looked through Rikyū's fear [of Hideyoshi] which he [Rikyū] shifted off craftily" (Chapter 15).⁶⁷ Rikyū's crafty manoeuvring seems to have hurt him more than anybody else.

4.3.4 Victory as a passing phenomenon and victory in eternity

Besides being Hideyoshi's tea master and advisor and a successful merchant, Rikyū is the one and only *chanoyu* artist in Japan, a relentless seeker after truth in art. This is the real focus of his life. Nogami's description of Rikyū's quality as a *chanoyu no*

⁶¹ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 134.

⁶² Kokei Sōchin (1532-1597), born into the warrior house of Asakura, was a Rinzai Zen monk. The close relationship between Rikyū and Kokei is known as early as 1573. See Karaki, *Sen no Rikyū*, p. 123; Yonehara, *Sen no Rikyū*, pp. 206-214; and *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 5, p. 719.

⁶³ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 144.

⁶⁴ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 136.

⁶⁵ See the chapter 12, NYZ I, vol. 13, pp. 242-255.

⁶⁶ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 198

⁶⁷ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 289.

mono (tea ceremony artist) helps the reader to imagine this vividly: "[When Rikyū performed the tea ceremony] he did not make tea, tea made itself" (Chapter 6).⁶⁸ Elsewhere she writes:

... nothing - *kama*, *hishaku*, *chawan*, *cha-ire* or *cha-shaku*⁶⁹ stayed as it was. Each was waiting for Rikyū's hands to touch it and [then] the utensils themselves moved and followed the course [of the tea ceremony], rather than being picked up, having hot water poured in, being rinsed and wiped. Just as nobody could name running water as this water or that water, nobody could identify, even if staring at him, how and in what order [he] did it. (Chapter 1)⁷⁰

Compared to the pitiful gambler [Hideyoshi], who was trying to grip Japan in his hand, [Rikyū] was, so to speak, a godly transcendental being, in the sense that he built a solid small universe of harmony and order, which only he could create, in a small space, completely isolated from the outside world by a golden folding screen. (Chapter 6)⁷¹

Rikyū's concept of *chanoyu* is "boiling water and drinking it [tea]" (Chapter 11). Therefore, performing *chanoyu* in a little grass hut in the countryside or in a room made of gold are the same for Rikyū, although it has taken long and tireless seeking, (which Nogami depicts in an admirable light), for him to reach this mental stage.⁷² Viewed from the summit of Rikyū's *wabi-cha*, Hideyoshi is just a "pitiful gambler".

Rikyū's superiority cannot be hidden, but Hideyoshi cannot accept that someone else is superior to himself, although he is proud of retaining the supreme tea master. In front of Rikyū, Hideyoshi, ostensibly the son of the Sun God, becomes one of Rikyū's many immature disciples. Nogami writes: "This was Hideyoshi's feeling of inferiority, hidden in the depths of his mind" (Chapter 20).⁷³ When Hideyoshi hosts a tea ceremony:

... though he [Hideyoshi] took the role of the master, the real master was indubitably Rikyū. Who else, including other magistrates, could be allowed to be like this? ... [This fact] stuck into Hideyoshi's nerve like a tiny splinter so small it

⁶⁸ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 160.

⁶⁹ Utensils necessary for the tea ceremony.

⁷⁰ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 32.

⁷¹ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 167.

⁷² NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 231.

⁷³ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 399.

usually did not touch even the tip of a finger. (Chapter 17)⁷⁴

Rikyū also knew very well that [for Hideyoshi] *chanoyu* was just a trifling hobby to attract people and that he never understood its heart nor had ever tried to do so. (Chapter 17)⁷⁵

Chanoyu is just a trifling hobby for Hideyoshi. However, he is threatened because Rikyū is the only person who can recognise his lack of serious interest. Rikyū reminds Hideyoshi of his pretence as a *suki-sha*. Hideyoshi senses in Rikyū an overwhelming presence, one which he wants others to sense in him but which he does not want to sense in anybody else.

Rikyū's wife Riki, whom he married after his first wife's death and whom he loves truly, has a brother, the Noh actor Torikai Yahei (a fictional figure). Yahei is a good-natured but frivolous character. He has an ambition to take a role in Hideyoshi's Noh play *Akechi Uchi*, and in order to achieve this ambition he ingratiate himself with Hideyoshi's Noh teacher, Kurematsu Shinkurō, who is close to the magistrate Ishida Mitsunari. Rikyū knows this fact and does not feel comfortable with it, but says nothing to anybody, not even Riki. He is always very careful about what he says to Yahei, because Yahei may frivolously repeat Rikyū's words to Shinkurō (and thereby to Ishida). However, Rikyū momentarily lets down his guard, remarks absently to Yahei, "Conquering China will not be as easy as *Akechi Uchi*". Yahei repeats Rikyū's words to several acquaintances as if these are rather clever comments on Hideyoshi's plan to conquer China. The words reach Ishida Mitsunari, for whom such implied criticism is unforgivable. Ishida views Rikyū as someone who undermines Hideyoshi's power and authority and thereby the entire hierarchy of the house of Toyotomi. Ishida wants to drag Rikyū down, but cannot do so because of Hidenaga's strong support for Rikyū. He also does not want the public to know of Rikyū's criticism, because the plan to conquer China is such a sensitive issue. Any doubts about the soundness of the plan must be hidden from the public. However, Ishida does not need to wait long to see Rikyū's tragic end.

Rikyū's circumstances change rapidly when his supporter, Hidenaga, dies in January 1591 (Chapter 17). Ishida Mitsunari and another magistrate plot to drag Rikyū down from his status as Hideyoshi's favourite advisor into practice. The wooden sculpture of Rikyū placed in the *sanmon* of Daitokuji gives them an excellent pretext for their

⁷⁴ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 329.

⁷⁵ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 334.

attack on Rikyū. They accuse Rikyū of raising himself higher than Hideyoshi, and the absence of Hidenaga means there is no one close to Hideyoshi to speak on Rikyū's behalf. When this conspiracy becomes clear to Rikyū, he says to his old friend Kokei, a Buddhist priest of Daitokuji, his disciple in *chanoyu* as well as his teacher in Zen, that he is tired of subordinating himself to Hideyoshi. Nogami describes the facial expression that Rikyū shows only to this old friend: "Rikyū distorted one side of his face ... [It] made [his] queerly suppressed anger rather distinct" (Chapter 18).⁷⁶

However, even when Rikyū is condemned to house arrest by Hideyoshi (at this time, neither Rikyū nor Hideyoshi thinks the former's death is near), Rikyū has plans to pursue his artistic ambitions, again utilising Hideyoshi's wealth and power. Nogami writes: "There were many things which Rikyū still wanted to do ... Hideyoshi's new [plan of] Fushimi Castle also gave new hope to Rikyū" (Chapter 21).⁷⁷ Rikyū is a political being, and one part of him enjoys the exercise of political power.⁷⁸ He cannot live without being involved in the exercise of political power. He once even helped to set up a plot for Hideyoshi to become Nobunaga's successor.⁷⁹ Nogami explains the relationship between the two men: "Rikyū was indispensable for Hideyoshi [as his closest advisor], more so than Hideyoshi for Rikyū as his indispensable patron" (Chapter 1).⁸⁰ This shows Rikyū's confidence in his own usefulness to Hideyoshi. Nogami, however, brings the political dimension of Rikyū into conflict with other aspects of his being. He is after all an artist and a seeker after truth.

When, towards the end of story, the monk Kokei asks Rikyū about his readiness to meet the consequences of the accusations about the wooden sculpture and his criticism of Hideyoshi's plan to invade China, Rikyū answers only by reciting one line from a Buddhist poem: "Thunder from a clear blue sky".⁸¹ After this scene, Rikyū resists the last temptation to remain alive by hiding his beliefs and apologising to Hideyoshi.

⁷⁶ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 367.

⁷⁷ NYZ I, vol. 13, pp. 407-408.

⁷⁸ "Hideyoshi to Rikyū o meguru", NYZ I, suppl. 2, p. 150.

⁷⁹ See NYZ I, vol. 13, pp. 100-101 and the interview "Hideyoshi to Rikyū o meguru", NYZ I, suppl. 2, p. 151. According to *Kokushi dai-jiten*, this plot by Rikyū elevated his position from that of the third to that of the top tea master in the house of Toyotomi. *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vol. 8, p. 482.

⁸⁰ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 29.

⁸¹ NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 368.

Finally Hideyoshi decides on the spur of the moment to destroy Rikyū. Despite the fact that there is a chance for Rikyū to survive if he apologises to Hideyoshi, he lets the only opportunity pass. Rikyū's refusal to apologise causes Hideyoshi to explode in anger and to order Rikyū's *seppuku*. However, Rikyū retains his belief to the end that Hideyoshi cannot destroy him or even take anything from him.⁸² In his dying face he shows this confidence and his pride that everything he created for Hideyoshi has been, in fact, for himself.⁸³

Rikyū performs *seppuku* with pride. The general public is curious about the whole incident, feeling a kind of *schadenfreude* at seeing such a spectacular fall of the once powerful advisor of the national unifier. The story ends with Kisaburō leaving the bridge, on which the wooden sculpture of Rikyū was crucified with his severed and unburied head left on the edge, for an unknown horizon. Kisaburō is rather calm and composed, discovering freedom from his father's glorious shadow and a feeling of closeness to his father that he has never had before.

4.4 Nogami's Rikyū

By reworking historical materials through her literary imagination, Nogami created Sen no Rikyū as a true seeker after truth. Nogami's Rikyū, therefore, is one who after a long mental struggle, overcame his "opportunism" and chose to live in the eternal freedom of a real artist. I can see, from Nogami's resolution of Rikyū's life, her understanding of how real artists, including herself, should live. She then extends her understanding to a question and asks the reader how we all ought to live. This is indeed the Socratic question. In this last section of this chapter, I would like to evaluate briefly the way Nogami depicted Sen no Rikyū in order to give her message to us.

From the beginning of the story, Nogami develops a clear and vital contrast between Hideyoshi and Rikyū and their underlying love-hate relationship. She introduces this never-surfacing conflict to set the basic tone of the story, which culminates in a dramatic explosion. She builds the story on this foundation with concrete events and a through description of the mental manoeuvres of both the historical and fictional

⁸² (Chapter 22), *NYZ I*, vol. 13, p. 436.

⁸³ (Chapter 22), *NYZ I*, vol. 13, p. 436-437.

characters in order to approach Rikyū's true character. Nogami uses fiction to try to reach Rikyū's full reality. She says in her diary entry of 26 December 1958 that she feels there were many aspects in Rikyū's personality, and that this is a common human phenomenon.⁸⁴ She leads the reader to a conclusion in which one of Rikyū's aspects overcomes another.

In order to describe the complicated situation surrounding Rikyū, Nogami uses the multi-layered feelings and relationships among the main characters, including the relationship between the monk Kokei of Daitokuji and Hideyoshi, between Kokei and Ishida, and between Yamanoue Sōji, Rikyū's top disciple, and Hideyoshi, to create in the reader a tension and an anxiety that, unless Rikyū can free himself from Hideyoshi, he will be lost in a web of intrigue. But, until the final period of his life, Rikyū does not free himself from his lord and does not even try to do so, although he longs for the free spirit of a real artist. Rikyū's love of power is that strong.

Nogami reveals her explanation of the true cause of Rikyū's death in the latter part of the novel.⁸⁵ The criticism of Hideyoshi, which Nogami sees as the reason for Rikyū's *seppuku*, has no place to survive after Hidenaga, a supporter and protector of Rikyū, dies. By that time, however, Rikyū is tired of being Hideyoshi's favoured tea master and his longing for a life solely as a tea ceremony artist becomes greater than ever. In his decision to accept death, one can find Nogami's 'discovery' in Rikyū's character of one of the features of Zen practitioners: they are usually strong spirited, with marked likes and dislikes, all related to self-liberation. She emphasises Rikyū's closeness to *satori* (spiritual awakening), as the result of his long battle against his "opportunism" and as the necessary consequence of his life as a real artist. In her description of Rikyū's *seppuku*, Nogami presents a clear contrast between Rikyū, who gains inner eternal peace and victory over his "opportunism", and Hideyoshi, whose glory is temporal and fleeting.

Nogami writes in her diary entry of 2 July 1958, when she was about to start writing *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*:

If the spirit of *chanoyu* is maintaining equanimity of mind through religious humility, peacefulness and secrecy, Rikyū was, in some way, a person who lived further from this spirit than anyone else. [However,] he not only attained victory over Hideyoshi by his death, but also returned for the first time to the [true] spirit

⁸⁴ NYZ II, vol. 13, p. 402.

⁸⁵ In the chapter 16, NYZ I, vol. 13, p. 314. This novel consists of 23 chapters.

of *chanoyu*.⁸⁶

This passage sums up Nogami's understanding of Rikyū's life and death. My reading of *Hideyoshi to Rikyū* suggests that Rikyū was indeed a seeker after *wabi-cha*. Rikyū tried to create a harmony between extreme luxury and extreme poverty,⁸⁷ between the golden tea room and the grass and mud tea room, and then sought to incorporate this harmony into his own life. For Rikyū both these rooms were the result of his unique creativity, manifested in different forms.⁸⁸ Rikyū thinks that if one cannot steep oneself in the real aesthetic reality of one's surroundings, whatever they are, one can never reach the spirit of *wabi-cha*, the summit of the tea ceremony. In my view, Nogami probably wanted to suggest, in the Hegelian language into which she was initiated by Tanabe and which influenced her way of thinking, that Rikyū tried to become the synthesis of thesis and antithesis.

The love of political power does not belong to *wabi*. Rikyū's struggle is caused by knowledge of this. Although he tries to convince himself that he can reach *wabi* while being Hideyoshi's tea master, he cannot retain this conviction. The seeker after *wabi-cha* within Rikyū and his longing for freedom as an artist win in the end.

⁸⁶ NYZ II, vol. 13, p. 320.

⁸⁷ NYZ I, vol. 13, pp. 16-17.

⁸⁸ Nogami later said in an interview, referring to Rikyū's two different types of tea rooms, that if there was a union of various forms of beauty the union itself became a form of beauty. See "*Hideyoshi to Rikyū o meguru*", NYZ I, suppl. 2, p. 148.

Chapter 5 Conclusion

5.1 General remarks: the objectives and the results

My overall purpose in this thesis has been to examine Nogami's interpretation of such originally European ideas as humanism, individual freedom and liberalism. In doing this I have discussed her own philosophy, which exemplifies the European influence important to Japanese intellectuals of her time. Nogami was a highly intellectual, philosophical, ethical and compassionate writer. She was a rare Japanese author for her time. Her novels display sharp observation and analysis of human behaviour in the context of both historical and contemporary Japanese society. The way in which a wide range of ideas are brought together and given compelling fictional expression means that Nogami's novels, especially those published after the Second World War, make a unique and important contribution to contemporary Japanese literature.

In this final chapter I would like to firstly recapitulate the main elements of my discussion of Nogami and identify what I see as her contemporary significance. I then would like to look briefly at the role of Japanese intellectuals from the end of the Second World War to the present, in order to suggest possibilities for further research.

As I noted in the Introduction, Nogami lived her long life at a time when the Japanese people experienced radical and chaotic changes in both their outer and inner lives. She lived through many wars in which Japan was directly involved: the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895, the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), the First World War, the Sino-Japanese War of 1937-1945 and the Second World War. She had a fortunate start in life by being born the daughter of wealthy parents who both wanted and could afford to send her to be educated in Tokyo. Her good fortune continued through her association with the great novelist, Natsume Sōseki, and with the philosopher Tanabe Hajime. Her husband Toyoichirō realised and believed in her talent, helped her to become an established writer, and was by and large understanding and supportive of her career throughout their marriage of thirty years. Nogami was favoured by fate to become a writer. However, it was she herself, through enormous dedication to her task, who made the best out of what fate handed her.

Although Nogami was one of the rare female novelists in the Japanese literary society of her time, especially after she started to write novels (in 1928 when she was forty-three) she explicitly refused to be judged as a "female writer". From her point of view, she was a "writer" pure and simple, and her gender was not an issue. In this respect, I can see the influence of her idea of individualism. She liked to think of her identity in terms of her humanity alone, without reference to particularities of gender, race or social class.

Nogami often strongly criticised the traditional Japanese style of literature in her essays, interviews and discussions. According to her, Japanese literature has too strong a tendency to address emotional subjects without a philosophical basis.¹ Nogami encountered Christianity at her school, Meiji Jogakkō. This era at the school was, as she repeatedly said later in her life, 'the formative period' of her thoughts. Through her school life, her marriage and her encounter with Natsume Sōseki, she was introduced to Western literature and ideas, to which she was immediately and deeply attracted, and from which she drew key principles of life.

Although Nogami wrote many short stories and essays, her strength as a writer is best shown in her novels. She is unique in taking philosophical ideas from a European context and giving them fictional development in a Japanese context - modern Japanese society (1935-1945) in *Meiro*, medieval Japan (1588-1591) in *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. While writing about Japan and the Japanese, she introduces key ideas from the Western philosophical tradition, such as individual freedom, liberal democracy and humanism, and gives them compelling artistic treatment.

Despite Nogami's dedication to her craft, there were times when she was discouraged by what she saw as inadequate recognition from Japanese literary society. As noted before,² she never wrote a *shishōsetsu* ("I novel"), a genre central to Japanese literature. She was a novelist following the method of Western authors as surveyors and manipulators of a vast social canvas. She was therefore relegated to the outskirts of Japanese literary society, although at the same time she was considered favourably by

¹ Nogami says that the Japanese literature should reduce its dependence on *The Tale of Genji*, which she read repeatedly over several decades, in order to get rid of this tendency. See the 1974 interview "Ryokuin kandan", *NYZ I*, suppl. 2, p. 236.

² See section 2.4, "Marriage".

some, including Maruyama Masao, Yanaihara Tadao,³ Katō Shūichi, Ōe Kenzaburō and Kaga Otohiko.

5.2 Nogami's blind spot

Nogami publicly criticised advocates of militarism and rearmament (nuclear weapons in particular), and others exposing views with which she disagreed. She wrote in 1960 in the magazine *Sekai* a short but very strong criticism of one of the post-war Prime Ministers, Kishi Nobusuke. In this essay ("Tenmō kaikai so ni shite morasazu"⁴) she compares Kishi to Adolf Eichman claiming that Kishi's hands are as bloody as Eichman's because he was one of the ministers of the Tōjō cabinet which oversaw atrocities in China during the war. (The fact that the pre-war plutocrats continued to occupy prominent political positions after the war is a problematic feature of contemporary Japan.)

However, in my view there is a certain oddity in Nogami. I have to come back to the question I raised in Chapter 3: why did Nogami carefully avoid publicly criticising Emperor Hirohito and his role in the war, despite voicing strong criticisms in her private diaries? In her 1967 essay, "Abe san no koto samazama", published in *Sekai* just after the death of her long-time friend, the philosopher Abe Yoshishige,⁵ Nogami thanks Abe

³ Yanaihara Tadao (1893-1961) was a well-known Christian academic who was forced to resign from Tokyo Imperial University in December 1937, the year Nogami published the original "Meiro", because of his criticism of the Japanese military government. In the article "Kokka no risō", published in *Chūō kōron* in September 1937, Yanaihara emphasised the importance of justice and peace. His forced resignation is known as one of the prime examples of the suppression of pacifist opinions. He regained a position in the university after the war. See Takenaka Yoshihiko, Chapter 5 "Yanaihara jiken", *Nihon-seijishi no naka no chishiki-jin*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Bokutakusha, 1995), pp. 253-275 and Yanaihara Tadao, "Tatakai no ato" *Kashin* (Tokyo: 1945); cited in Hidaka Rokurō, ed., *Sengo Nihon shisō taikei 1, Sengo-shisō no shuppatsu*, (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1968), pp. 315-326.

⁴ *NYZ I*, vol. 22, pp. 188-190. The title is from the ancient Chinese philosopher Lao zi, and means that the net of the heavenly law does not miss any wrongdoing.

⁵ According to Nogami, despite his liberal attitude during the post-war period, Abe moved to the right, especially after becoming the President of Gakushūin in 1946 (until 1966). (Gakushūin, a school catering for students of all ages, was for the nobility and other upper-class students before the war, although since the war it has been open to the general public.)

for his life-long friendship with both her and her husband. However, she then strongly criticises the study meeting between Emperor Hirohito and some prominent scholars, including Abe:

... Did they [the scholars] ever start to talk [to the emperor] about what only those intellectuals who tried to look at and think of things truly must have known, although the ministers of the cabinet or the members of the Diet pretended not to? That is how meagrely and with what kind of mentality the [ordinary Japanese] people lived [through the war], those who lost their parents, their husbands and sons, their houses and all of their possessions because of the war. [That is also] what the people had in the depths of their pitch-dark hearts consciously and unconsciously, which they could never completely forget despite trying to. If [the scholars] avoided [talking about] such subjects carefully and absolutely, they were merely a new type of eunuch.⁶

She continues in the same essay, referring to the published diaries of the poet and novelist Muro Saisei (1889-1962), in which he questions strongly whether Tōjō Hideki is the only one who was responsible for the war, that: "true freedom belongs not to scholars but to literary people". I cannot accept her words. The discrepancy between what she wrote about Emperor Hirohito in her diaries and in her published works remains. She might have thought that she did enough by writing her true feelings in her diary, because she was expecting it to be published after her death.⁷ If so, however, I still cannot agree with Nogami's attitude. I find it even more amazing that this discrepancy did not seem to bother her at any point of her life after the war. She never showed any regret or remorse for her reticence. This was a blind spot.

This introduces another issue. I believe that if Nogami really had taken fully to heart the idea of individual freedom and responsibility, she would have been able to see the discrepancy and consequently would have done something to fill the gap. But she did not. I see this as a common phenomenon among Japanese intellectuals of her time. In this case there could be much deeper, wider and fundamental problem in Japanese

⁶ NYZ I, vol. 22, p. 420.

⁷ According to her diary entry of 5 October 1965, Nogami allowed Iwanami Shoten to photograph her diaries as a record. She also indicates her expectation that her diaries will be published after her death. See NYZ II, vol. 15, p.190.

society. If intellectuals, who are better informed, cannot see their blind spot, it is hardly possible for the ordinary Japanese to see it.

5.3 Limits of Japanese intellectuals

1995 was the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War. There were commemorations in many parts of the world, in Europe, in America and in Asia, including Japan. The main issue in Japan was again whether or not the Japanese government should acknowledge and apologise for Japanese war-time atrocities. Again Japan failed to do this.⁸ One thing which struck me was the fact that the German Chancellor participated in greeting the VE-Day parade in Paris.⁹ It is impossible even to imagine the Japanese Prime Minister being invited to other Asian countries to greet the parade of their soldiers to commemorate the 15th of August, the end of the Second World War in Asia.

I noticed the difference in attitudes to the war between Germany and Japan when I lived in Germany from 1979 to 1980. I was surprised and very impressed to see the war museum in Berlin, in which there were many exhibits of German's war-time atrocities, particularly the attempted genocide of the Jews. By contrast, in Japan we find the memorial centres of the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki,¹⁰ but little if anything which bears witness to Japan as an offender. In the Yasukuni Shintō shrine in Tokyo, those who were responsible for the war and consequently punished for their war crimes, have the status of gods and are objects of worship by many Japanese.

In 1985, the year Nogami died, the president of (then) West Germany, Richard von Weizsäcker, made a famous speech titled "40 Jahrestag der Beendigung des Zweiten Weltkrieges" (The 40th anniversary of the Second World War).¹¹ Von Weizsäcker

⁸ I agree with Ōe Kenzaburō, who wrote in his 1986 essay "Sengo-bungaku kara atarashii bunka no riron o tsūka shite", that the fact that there are 600,000 Koreans in Japan as a disadvantaged minority indicates that the Korean-Japanese annexation of 1910 is still a current issue. *Sekai*, 492 (Tokyo: September 1986), p. 111.

⁹ Gluck; cited in "Sen-go 50-nen, kioku no chihei", *Sekai*, 615 (Tokyo: November 1995), pp. 25-26.

¹⁰ They are called 'Genbaku Kinenkan' in Hiroshima and 'Genbaku Shiryōkan' in Nagasaki.

¹¹ See Richard von Weizsäcker, "40-nenme no 5-gatsu yōka ni", *Sekai*, 481 (Tokyo: November 1985), pp. 184-198.

pointed out that if one closes one's eyes to the past, one becomes blind to the future, and he encouraged Germans to face the truth of the atrocious acts committed in their name during the war, and of the steps that took Germany to Nazism. In Japan, however, even as late as 1995, one looked in vain for something similar from politicians or members of the imperial family. Von Weizsäcker's speech caused something of a sensation in Japan, because, in my view, it touched a chord which reflective post-war Japanese have always had in their hearts but which Japanese intellectuals have failed to articulate.

I agree with the East Asian historian, Carol Gluck, who points out in the interview "Sen-go 50-nen, kioku no chihei"¹² that Japan had to wait until 1989, the year Hirohito died, to see the emperor as a mere symbol of the nation, as envisaged by the Constitution,¹³ instead of the divine figure he was before and during the war. I also agree with the widely held view that the fact Emperor Hirohito did not resign and was not punished after the war has encouraged the Japanese, both collectively and individually, to avoid reflecting on their responsibility for the war.¹⁴ Gluck continues that in the 1980s in Europe, through the trial in France of the German war criminal, Klaus Barbie, and the questions raised about the wartime actions of former UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, the understanding of responsibility for the war has changed from so-called "collective responsibility" to the recognition that each implicated individual also carries an individual responsibility.¹⁵ Gluck argues that Japan is still far from such an understanding. The Japanese have not even begun to think of responsibility for the war as something that should be considered individually.

A 1995 interview with Maruyama Masao in *Sekai* reveals that Japanese intellectuals in the post-war era did not share any feeling of responsibility for the war.¹⁶

¹² Gluck, "Sen-go 50-nen, kioku no chihei", *Sekai*, 615, pp. 22-34.

¹³ "The Emperor shall be the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people, deriving his position from the will of the people with whom resides sovereign power." The Constitution of Japan, Chapter I, Article 1.

¹⁴ The fact that Emperor Hirohito did not admit any kind of responsibility for the war was clearly revealed when he was interviewed by Japanese journalists for the first time in 1975. When he was questioned about 'war-responsibility' he said that he could not answer that sort of question because he did not know [how to use] literary rhetoric. See Yasumaru Yoshio, *Kindai tenno-zō no keisei*, Iwanami Shoten, 1992, pp. 7-9.

¹⁵ "Sen-go 50-nen, kioku no chihei", *Sekai*, 615, p. 24.

¹⁶ "Sanfuranshisuko kōwa, Chōsen sensō, 60-nen anpo", *Sekai*, No. 615, November 1995, pp. 35-48.

Nogami was no exception. From her point of view, all responsibility lay with Japanese militarism and its proponents. She was rather proud of her war-time behaviour, characterised by silence and withdrawal from the public sphere.

In his 1995 book, *Trust*,¹⁷ Francis Fukuyama points out the difference between Japanese and Chinese Confucianism, in particular in respect of their treatment of the virtue of loyalty. He writes:

When Confucianism was imported and adapted to Japanese conditions, however, the relative weight of these virtues [benevolence and loyalty] changed considerably. In a document typical of the Japanese interpretation of Confucianism, the imperial injunction to the armed forces issued in 1882, the virtue of loyalty was elevated to the first rank, and the virtue of benevolence was dropped from the list altogether. In addition, the meaning of loyalty changed subtly from its Chinese version. In China, there was an ethical sense that one had duties to oneself, that is, personal standards of behaviour to which one had to conform that served as the functional equivalent of a Western individual conscience. Loyalty to a lord had to be reconciled to this sense of duty to one's own principles. Duty to a lord in Japan, by contrast, had a much more unconditional character.¹⁸

Fukuyama argues that even filial piety was downgraded by the elevation of loyalty in Japan: loyalty to the lord outweighed loyalty to the family. As noted in chapter 2, the atmosphere in which Nogami grew up exemplified this conception of loyalty. Even for a person as reflective as Nogami, it seems that it was not possible to subject to rational scrutiny all the values with which one grew up. Although her secondary school, Meiji Jogakkō, was a Christian school and did not advocate the Imperial Rescript on Education, no one could be free from the forceful military regime of the time and its policy of thorough patriotic education. Such values become part of one's personality, of who one is.¹⁹ In order to scrutinise them, one has to undergo a form of psychological

In this interview, Maruyama recounts an episode in which Abe Yoshishige, known as a representative of liberalism in the post-war era, showed his anger at a suggestion that Japanese intellectuals might have some responsibility for the war, and the intellectual who raised the issue withdrew his suggestion quickly.

¹⁷ F. Fukuyama, *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1995).

¹⁸ Fukuyama, *Trust*, p. 178.

¹⁹ In his 1929 book, *Japan-Europa*, the German scholar, E. Lederer, wrote about his shocking experi-

surgery. This is a painful process which few have the courage and strength to face. Nogami went a long way down this path, but her attitude to Emperor Hirohito shows that she could not complete the journey.

Even intellectuals who are a few generations younger than Nogami seem to hesitate to criticise her blind spot. Writers and scholars such as Shinoda Kazushi, Ōe Kenzaburō, Katō Shūichi and Kaga Otohiko, who acknowledge Nogami's brilliant quality as a novelist, seem to hide any criticism under their respect for her. It is difficult to believe that they do not see the shortcomings of *Meiro*, the complete lack of criticism of Emperor Hirohito and his role in the war. (Kaga once tried to criticise this particular point directly in discussion with Nogami, but Nogami rejected his criticism, saying she did not have the freedom Kaga enjoyed.²⁰ Kaga did not pursue the matter.) I do not know the reason for this hesitation. Perhaps the fact that Nogami was much older, or that she was a woman, acted as a barrier. In that case, by refusing to acknowledge Nogami's shortcomings, these writers and scholars did not in fact treat Nogami with their full respect.

5.4 Possibility of further research

The blind spot Nogami had is still present in contemporary Japan. From an outsider's view, it seems as if this is a blind spot of the whole nation. If there is any prospect of overcoming this severe shortcoming, the Japanese must first of all exercise in a far more fundamental way than at present the unique human capacity for self-reflection. As part of this process Japanese intellectuals have to take responsibility for challenging the self-conception of the Japanese more seriously.

ence as an example of how thorough this loyalty was. According to Ledere, during the chaos of the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923, many school principals were burnt to death in order to protect *go-shin'ei*, a photograph of the Emperor and the Empress as an object of worship, from the fire. This was shocking enough for Ledere. However, more shockingly, no one suggested that it would have been better if the photograph had been burnt instead of those principals, although there were some suggestions that the photographs might have been better placed elsewhere. E. Lederer, *Japan-Europa* (1929); cited in Maruyama Masao, *Nihon no shisō*, pp. 31-32.

²⁰ See section 3.3.3, "Ambivalence within Nogami".

In his 1981 article "The Japan Myth Reconsidered",²¹ Katō Shūichi writes as part of his discussion of current Japanese society:

Japanese society today, as before, is characterised by competitive groupism. Groupism, a high degree of integration of each member into the group, implies the member's strong loyalty, primarily for the group and secondarily for the leader. If the group's interests clash with the leader's personal concerns, the group prevails and either replaces the leader or deprives him of his decision-making power. If the group's interests clash with the personal concerns of a member, the member, in principle, sacrifices those concerns, however vital they may be to him. Groupism offers a strong feeling of togetherness and a sense of security for the individual in the event of a crisis.²²

Individual Japanese still have a strong tendency to conform to group norms. Even if one has a strong belief against the norm, it is extremely difficult to express this, since this will lead to social isolation.²³ In such circumstances individual freedom is difficult to act on in daily life. Although post-war Japanese society has moved in an egalitarian direction, its egalitarianism is that of the Meiji reform, whereby all Japanese are equal as subjects of the sacred Emperor. As Katō correctly points out, this kind of egalitarianism does not include individual freedom.

The generation following Nogami's is now invited to complete the journey which she did not complete. This surely will be a painful process. The current Emperor may not occupy the same place in the Japanese psyche as his predecessor. However, unless this process is carried through, the Japanese will never know how to deal with a past (and therefore a present and a future) in which the Emperor and the imperial system acted as strong forces opposed to individual freedom, liberalism and pluralism.

²¹ Katō Shūichi, "The Japan Myth Reconsidered", *democracy*, 1: 3, (New York: July 1981), pp. 98-108.

²² Katō, "The Japan Myth Reconsidered", *democracy*, 1:3, p. 99.

²³ See Yasumaru, *Kindai tenno-zō no keisei*, pp. 2-5. Yasumaru writes about the difficulties that ordinary Japanese workers had to face when the Emperor was fatally ill between the autumn of 1988 and the beginning of 1989. Refusing to go along with fellow workers to sign the well-wishers' book for the Emperor, even if this was simply because of lack of time, apparently required great courage and determination.

Bibliography

In English

- Bergamini, David. *Japan's Imperial Conspiracy*. William Heinemann Limited, Great Britain, 1971.
- Bramsted, E.K. and Melhuish, K.J. ed. *Western Liberalism*. Longman Group Limited, New York, 1978.
- Cornford, Francis M. *Before And After Socrates*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1932.
- _____, ed. *The Republic Of Plato*, Oxford, 1941.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *The end of History and the Last Man*. Penguin books, 1992.
- _____. *Trust: The Social Virtues And The Creation Of Prosperity*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1995.
- Funk & Wagnall's Corporation. *Microsoft (R) Encarta*. Microsoft Corporation, 1994.
- Hamilton, E. and Huntington C., ed. *The Collected Dialogues Of Plato*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Havens, Thomas R H. *Valley Of Darkness: The Japanese People and World War Two*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc., 1978.
- Jowett, Benjamin, ed. *The Dialogues Of Plato*, London: Sphere Books Limited, 1970.
- Kato, Shuichi. "The Japan Myth Reconsidered". *democracy*, 1:3 (July 1981): 98-108.
- Kodansha Ltd., ed. *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*, vol. 1-9. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1983.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *A short history of Ethics - A history of moral philosophy from the Homeric age to the twentieth century*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Magill, Frank N, ed. *Masterpieces of World Philosophy*. New York: Harper Collins 1990.
- Mason, R.H.P.& Caiger, J.G. *A History of Japan*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc., 1973.
- Natsume Sōseki. "My Individualism". *Monumenta Nipponica*, XXXIV:1 (Spring 1979) 26-46.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Love's Knowledge - Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

O'Sullivan, Noël. *Fascism*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1983.

Pelczynski, Z.A. ed. *The State and Civil Society - Studies in Hegel's Political Philosophy*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Smith, II, Henry Dewitt. *Japan's First Student Radicals*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Tredennick, Hugh. *The Last Days of Socrates*. Penguin books, 1954.

Unno, T. and Heisig, J., ed. *The Religious Philosophy Of Tanabe*. Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press, 1990.

In German

Toller, Ernst. "Briefe aus Gefängnis". *Prosa Briefe Dramen Gedichte*, Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1961.

In Japanese: NB. - All Japanese books and articles were published in Tokyo unless otherwise indicated.

Arai Sakunosuke. "Fugōri no gensen". (First pub. in *Tōdai shinbun* in 1946), *Sengo Nihon shisōshi taikai 1, Sengo shisō no shuppatsu*, Hidaka Rokurō, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1968: 159-168.

Gluck, Carol. "Sen-go 50-nen, kioku no chihei". *Sekai*, No. 615 (November 1995): 22-34.

Greene, Grahame. *Uchi naru watashi (The Man Within)*. Hayakawa Shobō, 1986.

Ienaga Saburō. *Tanabe Hajime no shisōshiteki kenkyū*. Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1974.

Ikeda Hiroshi, Amano Keiichi, ed. *Kenshō: Shōwa no shisōshi II, Tenkō to yokusan no shisō-shi*. Shakai hyōronsha, 1989.

Irokawa Daikichi. *Minshūshi - sono hyaku-nen*. Kōdansha, 1991.

Kaga Otohiko. "Ai to sensō no kōzu - Meiro". *Bungei tenbō*, 5 (April 1974): 223-235.

_____. "Nogami Yaeko no chōhen shōsetsu". *Shinchō*, 81:6 (June 1984): 243-260.

_____. "Nogami Yaeko ron". *Buntai*, 4 (June 1978): 86-97.

Karaki Junzō. "Gaikokujin no nihon-kan". *Kindai nihon shisōshi VIII*, Chikuma Shobō, 1961: 283-350.

_____. *Sen no Rikyū*. Chikuma Shobō, 1963.

Katō Shūichi. "Nihonjin no sekai zō". *Kindai nihon shisōshi VIII*, Chikuma Shobō, 1961: 225-282.

Kokushi Dai Jiten Henshū Iinkai, ed. *Kokushi dai-jiten*, vols. 1-14. Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1987.

Kuwata Tadachika. *Sen no Rikyū kenkyū*. Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1976.

Maeda Ai. "Shiki ni okeru kiroku no mondai". *Kokubungaku*, 31:12 (October 1986): 28-34.

Maruyama Masao. *Gendaiseiji no shisō to kōdō*. Miraisha, 1964.

_____. "Gunkoku-shihaisha no seishin-keitai". (First pub. in *Chōryū* in 1949), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikai I*, *Sengoshisō no shuppatsu*, Hidaka Rokurō, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1968: 187-222.

_____. *Nihon no shisō*. Iwanami Shoten, 1961.

Masaoka Shiki. "Jojibun". (First pub. in 1900), *Shiki zenshū*, vols. 1-22, suppl. 1-3, Kōdansha, 1975-1978: vol. 14, 214-249.

_____. "Kenbun igai", *Fude makase*. (First pub. in 1889), *Shiki zenshū*, vols. 1-22, suppl. 1-3, Kōdansha, 1975-1978: vol. 10, 75-76.

Mizuo Hiroshi, ed. *Hideyoshi to Rikyū*, Shinchōsha (Shinchō bunko), 1969.

Murakami Hyōe. "Tennō no sensō sekinin". (first pub. in *Chūō kōron* in 1956), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikai 5*, *Kokka no shisō*, Yoshimoto Takaaki, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1969: 300-316.

Nakajima Kunihiro. "Shiki no shaseibun, Hakushū no shōhin - kindai sanbun ni okeru Shiki-teki na mono". *Kokubungaku*, 31:12 (October 1986): 121-127.

Nakamura Kikuo. "Tennō-sei fashizumu-ron yori". (first pub. in *Tennō-sei fashizumu-ron*, Hara Shobō, in 1967), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikai 5*, *Kokka no shisō*, Yoshimoto Takaaki, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1969: 224-249.

Nakamura Masanori, ed. *Nenpyō Shōwashi*. Iwanami Booklet, No. 15, Iwanami Shoten, 1989.

Nakamura Tomoko. *Ningen Nogami Yaeko - Nogami Yaeko no nikki kara*. Shisō no kagakusha, 1994.

Nakamura Yasuo. *Nō to nōmen no sekai*. Kyoto: Tankōsha, 1962.

_____. *Zoku - Nō to nōmen no sekai*. Kyoto: Tankōsha, 1963.

- Nakano Hajimu. *Benshōhō*. Chuōkōron sha, 1973.
- Natsume Sōseki. "Shaseibun". *Natsume Sōseki zenshū*, vols. 1-10, suppl 1, Chikuma Shobō, 1971-1973: vol. 9, 152-157.
- _____. "Watashi no kojīn-shugi", *Natsume Sōseki zenshū*, vols. 1-10, suppl. 1, Chikuma Shobō 1971-1973: vol. 10, 22-142.
- Nishida Haruo and Hata Hisashi, ed. *Nō, kyōgen Jiten*. Heibonsha, 1987.
- Nogami Yaeko. *Mori*. Shinchōsha, 1985.
- _____. *Nogami Yaeko zenshū I*. vols. 1-23, suppl. vols. 1-3 and *Geppō gappon*. Iwanami shoten, 1980-85.
- _____. *Nogami Yaeko zenshū II*. vols. 1-29 (31 volumes), Iwanami shoten, 1986-1991.
- Ōe Kenzaburō. Recorded lecture, "Hontō ni chiteki na ikikata - Nogami Yaeko to sono jidai", *Shinchō kasetto kōen*, Shinchōsha, 1992.
- _____. "Kakushin sareta erosu". *Sekai*, No. 475 (June 1985): 318-323.
- _____. "Ōinaru imōto no chikara". *Shinchō*, 81:6 (June 1984): 256-260
- _____. "Posuto-sengo-sedai to seigi". *Sekai*, No. 496 (January 1987): 60-75.
- _____. "Sengo-bungaku kara atarashii bunka no riron o tsūka shite". *Sekai*, No. 492 (September 1986): 111-127.
- _____. "Sengo-bungaku kara kon'nichi no kyūkyō made". *Sekai*, No. 486 (March 1986): 238-248.
- Ōoka Shōhei. "Nogami sensei no hyaku-nen". *Shinchō*, 81:6 (June 1984): 222-224.
- Ogura Kinnosuke. "Shizenkagakusha no hansei". (First pub. in *Sekai* in 1946), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikēi 1*, *Sengoshisō no shuppatsu*, Hidaka Rokurō, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1968: 329-339.
- Owada Tetsuo. *Toyotomi Hideyoshi*. Chuō kōron sha, 1985.
- Ōyama Ikuo. "Sensō sekinin to tennō no taii". (First pub. in *Chuō kōron* in 1948), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikēi 5*, *Kokka no shisō*, Yoshimoto Takaaki, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1969: 275-281.
- Sakasai Hisako. *Nogami Yaeko*. Miraisha, 1992.
- Senuma Shigaki. "Nogami Yaeko no sekai", Nos. 1-21. *Nogami Yaeko zenshū I*, *Geppō gappon*, Iwanami Shoten, 1985.

Shinoda Kazushi. "Meiro no koto". *Tosho*, 370, (June 1980): 25-26.

_____. "Nogami Yaeko Meiro ron - Yakuwari o ushinatta shujinkō".
Mita bungaku (June 1957): 27-34.

Takahashi Hideo. "Nagai tsukiru koto no nai haru - Nogami Yaeko Mori". *Gunzō*
(February 1986): 294-295.

Takahashi Kazumi, ed. "Zadankai - Bungakusha no sekimu". (First pub. in *Ningen* in
1946), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikēi* 13, *Sengo bungaku no shisō*, Chikuma Shobō,
1969: 91-113.

Takayama Iwao. "Tanabe tetsugaku no shiteki-igi to tokushoku", *Tanabe tetsugaku*
towa, Kyoto: Itōen tōeisha (Tōei senshō 17), 1991: 74-94.

Takenaka Yoshihiko. *Nihon-seijishi no naka no chishiki-jin*, vols. 1-2. Bokutakusha,
1995.

Takenishi Hiroko, ed. *Nogami Yaeko zuihitsu-shū*. Iwanami Shoten (Iwanami bunko),
1995.

_____. "Zuihitsu no Nogami Yaeko". *Sekai*, No. 610 (July 1995): 286-297.

Takumi Hideo. "Shiki shasei-ron no genryū". *Kokubungaku*. 31:12 (October 1986):
90-97.

Tanabe Hajime. *Tanabe Hajime zenshū*, vols. 1-15 and *Geppō*. Chikuma Shobō,
1963-1964.

Tanikawa Tetsuzō. "Nogami Yaeko no bungaku sekai". *Sekai*, No. 475 (June 1985):
324-332.

Tsuda Michio. "Marukusu shugi to kokka no mondai". (First pub. in *Kokka-ron no*
fukken, Morita Shoten, in 1967), *Sengo Nihon shisō taikēi* 5, *Kokka no shisō*,
Yoshimoto Takaaki, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1969: 181-190.

Yanaihara Tadao. "Tatakai no ato". (First pub. in *Kashin* in 1945), *Sengo Nihon shisō*
taikēi 1, *Sengoshisō no shuppatsu*, Hidaka Rokurō, ed., Chikuma Shobō, 1968:
315-326.

Yasumaru Yoshio. *Kindai tennō-zō no keisei*. Iwanami Shoten, 1992.

Yonehara Masayoshi. *Sen no Rikyū*. Kyoto: Tankōsha, 1993.

Chronological record

- NB: This is mainly based on the chronological record (*chosaku nenpu*) in *Nogami Yaeko zenshū I*.
 The number in brackets after the year is Nogami's age.
 The order of works follows basically the order of publication.
 Details of publications are presented as follows: the title, the name of the magazine or newspaper or the publisher of the book.
 I omit translations and children's stories.
- 1885 (Born the daughter of Kotegawa Kakusaburō and Masa on 6 May.)
 1895 (10) (End of Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895.)
 1905 (20) (End of Russo-Japanese War.)
 1906 (21) (Graduated from Meiji Jogakkō and married Nogami Toyoichirō.)
 "Meian". (not published until after Nogami's death, *NYZ II*, vol. 28)
 1907 (22)
 "Enishi" and "Tanabata sama". *Hototogisu*, 10:5 and 10:9.
 "Hotoke no za". *Chūō kōron*, 22:7.
 1908 (23)
 "Shion". *Shin-shōsetsu*, 13:1.
 "Kaki yōkan" and "O-tonari". *Hototogisu*, 11:4 and 11:6.
 "Chihan". *Chūō kōron*, 23:3.
 "Byōnin". *Hototogisu*, 12:1.
 "Onna dōshi". *Kokumin shinbun*, from 8 to 27 Dec.
 1909 (24)
 "Hato-kō no hanashi", "Ringo" and "Bochi o tōru". *Hototogisu*, 12:7, 13:1 and 13:3.
 1910 (25) (Completion of the annexation of Japan and Korea. First son, Soichi, born.)
 "Hahaue sama", "Kankyo" and "Kai inu". *Hototogisu*, 13:8, 13:11 and 14:1.
 1911 (26)
 "Bochi o tōru 2". *Hototogisu*, 14:6.
 "Mebae". *Hototogisu*, 14:8.
 "Omori no ki". *Kokumin shinbun*, 19 Jun.
 "Tanoshimi ōki kōgai seikatsu". *Fujin gahō*, 58.
 "Nioi", *Yomiuri shinbun*, 9 Jul.
 "Chichi-oya to san'nin no musume". *Hototogisu*, 14:13.
 "Danjō to yonda hato" and "Mushiboshi no han'nichi". *Fujin gahō*, 60 and 61.
 1912 (27)
 "Aki no ichinichi". *Hototogisu*, 15:4.
 "Oyū". *Fujokai*, 5:1.
 "Minokichi no aru hi". *Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun*, 2 Jan.
 "Hōbai". *Shukujo kagami*, 2:3.
 "Akebono no mado yori". *Shin-shōsetsu*, 17:4.
 "Fūfumono" and "Aru hi no chōshoku mae". *Hototogisu*, 15:7 and 15:8.
 "Terejiya no kanashimi" (later "Chichi oya to san'nin no musume"). *Chūō kōron*, 27:8.
 "Shōdōbutsu". *Fujin gahō*, 72.
 "Kyōnosuke no inemuri". *Seitō*, 2:9.
 "Shunpei san no hanashi". *Fujin hyōron*, 1.
 "Shishin". *Hototogisu*, 16:2.
 1913 (28) (Second son, Mokichirō, born.)
 "Anemone no hana". *Fujin hyōron*, 2:1.
 "Kowareta omocho no uma". *Fujin gahō*, 80.
 "Shi". *Fujin hyōron* 2:7.

- "Yubiwa". *Chūō kōron*, 28:13.
- 1914 (29) (Outbreak of First World War. Death of Nogami's father.)
 "Netami". *Shojo*, 10:1.
 "Tegami", "Fudai no sanbi" and "Go-henji". *Fujin gahō*, 92, 93 and 94.
 "Atarashiki inochi" and "Nee, aka sama". *Seitō*, 4:4 and 4:5.
 "Somei yori (1)". *Fujin gahō*, 96.
 "Itsutsu ni naru ko". *Chūō kōron*, 29:7.
 "Somei yori (2)". *Fujin gahō*, 99.
 "Toshiko shi ni tsuite egaku watashi no gensō". *Chūō kōron*, 29:9.
 "Aru onna no tegami". *Shin nihon*, 4:10.
 "Tegami o kaku hi". *Fujin gahō*, 100.
 "Aru yo no hanashi" (later "Shi"). *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, from 21 Sep. to 4 Oct.
- 1915 (30)
 "Chichi no shi". *Mita bungaku*, 6:2.
 "Uwasa". *Bunshō sekai*, 10:2.
 "Futari no gakkō tomodachi no taiwa". *Hankyō*, 1:9.
 "Senrei no hi". *Shinchō*, 22:3.
 "Furusato yori". *Fujin gahō*, 106.
 "Gutaiteki mondai no gutaiteki kaiketsu". *Hankyō*, 2:3.
 "K-danshaku fujin no isho". *Chūō kōron*, 30:4.
 "Shimai". *Fujin gahō*, 108.
 "Konoyō na shōsetsu ga hoshii". *Jiji shinpō*, 25 Jun.
 "Ie". *Fujin zasshi*, 4:1.
 "Shi-shin". *Seitō*, 5:8.
 "Ni-tō no kouma" (later "Koyubi"). *Chūō kōron*, 30:11.
- 1916 (31) (Death of Natsume Sōseki.)
 "Mittsu no hanashi" (later "Futatsu no hanashi"). *Fujin gahō*, 118.
 "Shūi". *Shinchō*, 24:1.
 "Aru hi no koto". *Ōsaka Asahi shinbun*, from 1 to 2 Jan.
 "Futari no chiisai bagabondo" (later "Chiisai kyōdai"). *Yomiuri shinbun*, from 1 Jan. to 17 Mar.
 "Iro iro na koto". *Seitō*, 6:2.
 "Hōka satsujin han" (later "Himitsu"). *Chūō kōron*, 31:4.
 "Unmei". *Bunshō sekai*, 11:7.
 "Uzu". *Taiyō*, 22:11.
- 1917 (32) (Russian revolution.)
 "Koneko". *Ōsaka Mainichi shinbun*, from 1 to 2 Jan.
 "Kanojo". *Chūō kōron*, 32:2.
 "Wagaya no maru-tenjō". *Shinchō*, 26:5.
 "Musume no yomu beki shomotsu". *Fujin kōron*, 2:7.
 "Happyō shita ni-saku". *Shinchō*, 27:6.
- 1918 (33) (End of First World War. Third son, Yōzō, born.)
 "Hitotsu no mono" (later "Tazuko"). *Taiyō*, 24:1.
 "Reikon no akanbō" (later *Ningen sōzō* - *Reikon no akanbō*) and "Jokyōju B no kōfuku". *Chūō kōron*, 33:1 and 33:10.
 "Watashi no shōsetsu ni tsuite" and "Toboshii shūkaku". *Shinchō*, 29:5 and 29:6.
- 1919 (34)
 "Hahaoya no tsūshin". *Ōsaka Mainichi shinbun*, from 8 to 29 Jun.
 "Ima no watashi no kokoro". *Nihon oyobi Nihonjin*, 763.
- 1920 (35)
 "Seibetsu". *Chūō kōron*, 35:1.
 "Osoroshii keiji". *Taiyō*, 26:1.
 "Fujito". *Kaizō*, 2:1.

- "Aisatsu". *Fukuoka Nichi nichu shinbun*, 2 Jan.
 "Kantan". *Chūō kōron*, 35:10.
 "Aru shōjo no fushigi na shi". *Josei Nihonjin*, 1:3.
 "Happyō shitano wa yottsu". *Shinchō*, 33:6.
- 1921 (36)
 "Aru hito-kumi". *Kaizō*, 3:1.
 "Pandora no hako". *Tōkyō Nichi nichu shinbun*, 3 Jan.
 "Hitotsu no ie" (later "Shoyū"). *Chūō kōron*, 36:4.
 "Aru otoko no tabi". *Chūō kōron*, 36:10.
 "Bungei-in setsuritsu no zehi to kibō" and "Shinu made niwa". *Shinchō*, 35:5 and 35:6.
- 1922 (35)
 "Aru onna no hanashi". *Chūō kōron*, 37:1.
 "Aya no tsuzumi". *Kaizō*, 4:1.
Shōsetsu muttsu (Hitotsu no ie, Jokyoju B no kōfuku, Aru notoko no tabi, Aru onna no hanashi, Tazuko, Hahaoya no tsūshin). *Kaizōsha*, 26 Apr.
 "Kaijin-maru". *Chūō kōron*, 37:10.
 "Shōjin-ko yori". *Shūkan Asahi*, 2:12.
Kaijin-maru. *Shun'yōdō*, 28 Dec.
- 1923 (38)
 "Sumiko". *Chūō kōron*, 38:4.
 "Junzō to sono kyōdai". *Chūō kōron*, 38:10.
 "Moeru kako". *Kaizō*, 5:10.
 "Noe san no koto". *Josei Kaizō*, 2:11.
- 1924 (39)
 "Kirisuto to sofū to haha". *Chūō kōron*, 39:1.
 "Shibarareta mono to toku mono" (later *Shibarareta mono*). *Kaizō*, 6:1.
 "Okayo". *Chūō kōron*, 39:4.
 "Yume". *Kaizō*, 6:4.
Kaijin-maru, sono ta (Kaijin-maru, Tazuko, Shoyū). *Kaizōsha*, 15 Sep.
 "Yottsu no sakuhin". *Shinchō*, 41:6.
- 1925 (40)
 "Kurutta tokei". *Chūō kōron*, 40:1.
 "Chōfukō" (later "Furusato"). *Kaizō*, 7:1.
Atarashiki inochi (Atarashiki inochi, Chiisai kyōdai, Hahaoya no tsūshin, Koyubi, Uzu). Iwanami Shoten, 25 Mar.
 "Shin" and "Cha-ryōri". *Chūō kōron*, 40:4 and 40:10.
 "Ichi-ju no kage". *Kaizō*, 7:9.
 "Hiyō wa mite imasen". *Shinchō*, 43:6.
- 1926 (41)
 "Shinju" and "Ōishi Yoshitomo". *Chūō kōron*, 41:4 and 41:9.
Ningen sōzō (Ningen sōzō, Reikon no akanbō, Shibarareta nomo, Aya no tsuzumi, Kantan, Jujito, Himitsu). Iwanami Shoten, 25 Apr.
 "Nijū-nen mae no watashi". *Bunshō kurabu*, 11:10.
- 1927 (42)
 "Michinoku no tabi". *Kaizō*, 9:1.
 "Memorandamu". *Daichōwa*, sōkangō.
 "Kusarekaketa ie". *Kaizō*, 9:5.
 "Shi to mondo". *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, from 24 and 27 Jul.
 "Futatsu no tsuzumi". *Daichōwa*, Aug.
 "Kata-ashi no mondai". *Sandē mainichi*, 6:41.
 "Nyūgaku shiken otomo no ki". *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, from 29 Sep. to 14 Oct.
- 1928 (43)
 "Taishū bungaku no dōtoku". *Kaizōsha bungaku geppō*, 15.

- Ōishi Yoshitomo. Iwanami bunko, 5 Mar.
 "Mari Bashukirutsuefu". *Fujin no tomo*, 22:4.
 "Omoide futatsu". *Sōseki zenshū*, vol. 16, Geppō 5.
 "Machiko" (*Machiko*), "Aru soshiarisuto" (*Machiko*). *Kaizō*, 10:8, 10:9.
 "Dore no sōga". *Fujin no tomo*, 22:12.
Meiji Taishō bungaku zenshū 33 (Ōishi Yoshitomo, Kaijin-maru, Chichioya to san'nin no musume). Shun'yōdō, 15 Dec.
- 1929 (44) (Beginning of the Great Depression.)
 "Danna sama, Kodomo, Inu" (*Machiko*). *Kaizō*, 11:1.
Kaijin-maru. Iwanami bunko, 25 Jan.
 "Tsumetai moya" (*Machiko*). *Kaizō*, 11:3.
 "Shin-sotsugyōsei ni okuru nijū-ikkun". *Fujin no tomo*, 23:4.
 "Nyūgaku shiken ni tsuite" (later "Aru hihyō ni kotaete"). *Kaizō*, 11:5.
Nihon gikyoku zenshū 36 (Shibarareta mono, Fujito). Shun'yōdō, 23 Jul.
 "Moyuru bara" (*Machiko*). *Kaizō*, 11:10.
 "Megane". *Shisō*, 90.
- 1930 (45):
 "Gin no dokuraku" (*Machiko*). *Kaizō*, 12:1.
 "Nanban no yume". *Bungei shunjū*, 8:2.
 "Kanojo to haru" (*Machiko*). *Kaizō*, 12:5.
 "Chi" (*Machiko*). *Chūō kōron*, 45:12.
- 1931 (46) (Manchuria Incident.)
 "Karuizawa fujin no tegami". *Shūkan Asahi*, 19:1.
 "Akutagawa san ni shi o susumeta hanashi". *Bungei shunjū*, 9:3.
Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshū 56 (Chiisai kyōdai, Hahaoya no tsūshin, Kaijin-maru, Ōishi Yoshitomo, Kataashi no mondai, Shibarareta mono, Kusarekaketa ie). Kaizōsha, 15 Mar.
Machiko. Tettō Shoin, 14 Apr.
 "Tōzen no zenshin". *Nyonin geijutsu*, 4:7.
 "Genji monogatari to teppōdama". *Iwanami kōza*, *Nihon bungaku*, 15 Jul.
 "Mayoeru hahatachi e no megumi". *Iwanami kōza*, *Kyōiku kagaku tokuhō*, summer.
 "Naru Asamayama no fumoto kara". *Fujin kōron*, 16:10.
 "Kodomo no shisō ni tsuite". *Nyonin geijutsu*, 4:10.
- 1932 (47) (The 5.15 Incident.)
 "Tsumi wa onna ni aru ka". *Fujin kōron*, 17:2.
 "Unzen". *Bungei shunjū*, 10:7.
 "Rei - Urikire mōshisōrō". *Fujin saron*, 4:7.
 "Wakai musuko". *Chūō kōron*, 47:13.
- 1933 (48)
 "Yume". *Fujin no tomo*, 27:1.
 "Heibon na koto ka". *Fujin kōron*, 18:3.
Nyūgaku shiken otomo no ki, sono ta (collected essays). Koyama Shoten, 10 Mar.
 "Haru" (later "Ichigū no haru"). *Shūkan Asahi*, 23:16.
 "Honno hitokoto". *Kyōiku*, sōkangō.
 "Shi-shin". *Fujin kōron*, 18:5.
 "Wagako o kataru". *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, 23 May.
 "Ojōsan" (later "Mebae"). *Keizai ōrai*, 8:8, *Shinsaku sanjū-san-nin shū*.
 "Nikki" (later "Aru hi"). *Kagayaku*, 5.
Wakai musuko (Wakai musuko, Shinju, Cha-ryōri, Kirusuto to sofū to haha). Iwanami Shoten, 17 Jul.
 "Anshin na basho de jiyū ni". *Sandē mainichi*, 12:35.
 "Butai geijutsu no hanashi" (discussion). *Fujin no tomo*, 27:9.
 "Yama-bito no tayori". *Tettō*, 2:9.

- "Tori yottsu" (later "Tori"). *Bungei shunjū*, 11:10.
 "Sentō yawa" (later "Aki futatabi"). *Shūkan Asahi*, 24:16.
 "Dōwa bungaku". *Iwanami kōza, Sekai bungaku*, 5 Nov.

1934 (49)

- "Futatsu no tamashii" (later "Unmei"). *Fujokai*, 49:1.
 "Wakai musume o motta itoko e". *Fujin kōron*, 19:3.
 "Furusato no haha yori". *Kingu*, 10:4.
 "Shin-nyūgaku jidō to kyōiku mondai" (discussion). *Kyōiku*, 2:4.
 "Notsukeushi". *Bungei*, 2:5.
 "Sekai saisho no daigaku joshi-kyōju, Sōnya Kobarefusukaya". *Fujin kōron*, 19:6.
 "Shōgakusei no haha e no tsūshin" (later "Shōgakusei no haha e"). *Jidō*, 1:1.
 "Nikkishō". *Fujin bungei*, 1:1.
 "Pandora no hako". *Fujin kōron*, 19:7.
 "Wakai Jokyōshi e". *Jidō*, 1:2.
 "Nōson no haha to ko ni okuru" (later "Nōson no haha to ko ni"). *Jidō*, 1:3.
 "Yama no ie kara". *Jidō*, 1:4.
 "Yama no ie kara". *Fujin kōron*, 19:10.
 "Shūzan shōkei". *Gendai*, 15:11.
 "Wakaki oi ni tsuite itoko e". *Chūō kōron*, 49:13.

1935 (50) (Travelled to Taiwan with Soichi in autumn.)

- "Ko-oni no uta". *Chūō kōron*, 50:1.
 "Otsune no shōsetsu". *Shūkan Asahi*, 27:5.
 "Ragado daigaku sankan-ki hoi". *Chūō kōron*, 50:3.
 "Izu no tabi kara". *Kagayaku*, 3:3.
 "Musume e no tegami" (later "Musume e"). *Fujin kōron*, 20:4.
 "Kanashiki shinju". *Fujin no tomo*, 29:4.
 "Natsume sensei no koto" (later "Natsume sensei no omoide"). *Bungei*, 3:5.
 "Sekishun o yonde". *Teikoku daigaku shinbun*, 13 May.
 "Kokoro". *Shūkan Asahi*, 27:26.
 "Aoba no tayori". *Chūō kōron*, 50:6.
 "Shunchū". *Fujin kōron*, 20:6.
 "Kekkon oyobi kekkon seikatsu o kataru" (discussion). *Fujin no tomo*, 29:6.
 "Ryokuin shamei". *Shisō*, 158.
 "Onna no tachiba kara" (later "Sōrin - shūi"). *Yomiuri shinbun*, from 4 Sep. 1935 to 3 Feb. 1936.
 "Sansō". *Fujin kōron*, 20:10.
 "Kanashiki shōnen". *Chūō kōron*, 50:11.
 "Josei e no kotoba". *Fujin kōron*, 20:11.

1936 (51) (The 2.26 Incident.)

- "Sakka no tsutome". *Bungei tsūshin*, 4:2.
 "Kitai no jisshi-goroshi o kangaeru kai". (discussion) *Fujin kōron*, 21:2.
 "Danpen". *Chūō kōron*, 51:3.
 "Wakaki tomo e no tegami" (later "Wakai tomo e"). *Fujin kōron*, 21:3.
 "Chiisai kutsu" (later "Terada san no koto"). *Shisō*, 166.
 "Taiwan yūki" (later "Taiwan"). *Kaizō*, 18:4.
 "Shite mite yoki ni tsuku beshi" (later "Zeami no kotoba"). *Bungaku*, 4:4.
 "Bankai no hitobito" (later "Taiwan"). *Kaizō*, 18:5.
 "Kon'nichi oyobi asu no danse o kataru" (discussion). *Fujin no tomo*, 30:5.
 "Ko ni kataru haha no dokuhon". *Fujin kōron*, from 21:6 to 22:5.
 "Seifū", "Ryokusō taidan" (discussion). *Kagayaku*, 4:6, 4:7.
 "Tabidatsu ko ni". *Fujin no tomo*, 30:10.
 "Kuroi gyōretsu" (*Meiro*). *Chūō kōron*, 51:11.
 "Tsūshin". *Kagayaku*, 4:11.

- Yōseiken* (Kuroi gyōretsu, Notsuke ushi, Kanashiki shōnen, Ichigū no haru, Mebae, Ko-oni no uta). *Chūō kōronsha*, 25 Nov.
- "Ya ka dangan ka". *Fujin kōron*, 21:12.
- "Go, roku-nen go no kare no kokoku o". *Bungaku an'nai*, 2:12.
- Wakaki tomo e no tegami* (collected essays). Tōkō Shoin, 1 Dec.
- "Hitotsu no chūmon" (later "Rōma e tabidatsu musuko ni"). *Gakusei to kyōyō*, 4 Dec.
- 1937 (52) (Outbreak of Sino-Japanese War.)
- "Tashō no en". *Teikoku daigaku shinbun*, 1 Jan.
- "Kanashiki shōnen". *Jinmin bunko*, 2:2.
- "Watashi no urei, watashi no yorokobi (mata wa kibō)". *Fujin no tomo*, 31:1.
- "Wakaki tomo e no tegami". *Shinjoen*, 1:1.
- "Nyūgaku shiken o rei to shite". *Kodomo no kenkyū*, 6:1.
- "Hitotsu no negigoto", "Semete ippon no ki ni". *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, 1 Jan., 8 Apr.
- "Hitotsu no kibō". *Nihon dokusho shinbun*, 11 Apr.
- "Tokyo Asahi sinbun' shijō sōdan". *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, from 13 Apr. 1937 to 29 Apr. 1938.
- "Utsukushiki doro" (later "Utsukushiki deido"). *Fujin kōron*, 22:5.
- "Gendai o kōsei ni uttaeru mono". *Tanka kenkyū*, 6:6.
- "Tanshin". *Kagayaku*, 5:7.
- "Sanchū dokugo" (later "Sankyo"). *Sedai*, 2:8.
- "Yuya Matsukaze ni yone no ii". *Fujin no tomo*, 31:9.
- "Fujin kōron kantōgen" (later "Danshō"). *Fujin kōron*, from 22:9 to 26:6.
- "Josei sōdan o ukemotte" (later "Ippon no ki"). *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, from 14 Sep. to 17 Sep.
- Shūfū-chō* (collected essays). Sagami Shobō, 20 Sep.
- "Hahakigi no uta". *Fujin no tomo*, from 31:10 to 31:12.
- "Gengo mango". (later "Danshō") *Bungaku*, 5:10.
- "Bungaku no tsūfukō" (later "Danshō"). *Teikoku daigaku shinbun*, 18 Oct.
- "Meiro" (*Meiro*). *Chūō kōron*, 52:12.
- "Sansō zakki" (later "Sankyo"). *Kaizō*, 19:14.
- 1938 (53) (Travelled to Europe with husband.)
- "Kami nomi zo shiru". *Kaizō*, 20:1.
- "Furui o-tomodachi". *Fujin kōron*, 23:1.
- "Beikoku e kokumin shisetsu, Ichikawa Haruko san". *Fujin no tomo*, 32:1.
- "Koto danshō" (later "Nara"). *Gendai*, 19:1.
- "Kyō no yume". *Bungei shunjū*, 16:1.
- "Wakaki tomo e". *Shinjoen*, 2:1.
- "Senshun-ki". *Tokyo Asahi shinbun*, from 12 to 14 Feb.
- "Sensei de ari tomodachi de atta otto" and "Gakusō o sudatsu wakaki josei ni" (later "Hana-tabu no kawari ni"). *Fujin kōron*, 23:3 and 23:4.
- "Hototogisu go-hyaku-gō kinen shū". *Hototogisu*, 41:7.
- "Banshun-ki" (later "Koniwa"). *Gendai*, 19:5.
- "Kyōtan subeki geijutsu" (later "Danshō"). *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, 11 May.
- "Rōma e no shishin" (later "Tayori"). *Bungei*, 6:6.
- "Nihon no josei". *Tokyo Asahi shinbun* 25 Jun.
- "Yamamoto Yūzō shi cho, Sensō to futari no fujin" (later "Danshō"). *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, 11 Jul.
- "Shina ni iru wakaki tomo e" (later "Shina ni iru hito e"). *Bungei shunjū*, 16:13.
- "Ōshū ni tabi suru ni atarite" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Tosho*, 35.
- 1939 (54) (Travelled in Europe and USA.)
- "Mu shushō o miru" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, from 17 to 19 Jan.
- "Ōshū dayori". *Fujin no tomo* 33:2.
- "Kaigai kara" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Fujin kōron* 24:3.

- "Rōma no daigaku toshi" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Fujin no tomo* 33:4.
 "Kaigai dayori" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Fujin kōron*, from 24:4 to 24:12.
 "Ruburan no hōei" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Fujin to tomo* 33:6.
 "Kokusai ai mo nigiyaka ni Pari o saru hōjin". *Tōkyō Asahi shinbun*, 29 Sep.
- 1940 (55)
 "Rondon no ie" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Chūō kōron*, from 55:1 to 55:2.
 "Ochūdo nikki" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Fujin kōron*, 25:1.
 "Pari no yokogao". *Gahō yakushin no nihon*, 5:1.
 "Nogami Yaeko o mukaete" (discussion). *Bungei*, 8:1.
 "Utsukushiki gunzō" (later "Furansu no ippen"). *Bungei*, 8:5.
 "Joryū-sakka yomoyama-banashi". *Chūō kōron*, 55:2.
 "Ryogan nikki" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Fujin kōron*, from 25:4 to 25:12.
 "Hana no Rōma" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Tosho*, 51.
 "Fūfu no michi" (later "Otto to tsuma"). *Fujin kōron*, 25:6.
 "Pari-sai" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kaizō* 22-12.
 "Bunka hasshō no chi" (later "Frusato danshō"). *Fujin no tomo*, 34:7.
 "Ejiputo danshō" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Shisō*, 220.
 "Aki". *Fujin kōron*, 25:10.
- 1941 (56) (Outbreak of Pacific War. Death of Nogami's mother.)
 "Yamanba". *Chūō kōron*, 56:1.
 "Yanusu no kao". *Asahi shinbun*, 13 Jan.
 "Nan'ō-ki" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kōron*, 4:2.
 "Ubauna goraku o". *Asahi shinbun*, 13 Feb.
 "Shūberuto no ie" and "Barukan no mon" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kōron*, 4:3 and 4:4.
 "Higashi-chichūkai no tabi" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kaizō*, 23:9.
 "Tabi no nōto kara" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Sedai*, 17.
 "Berurin danshō" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kōron*, 4:6.
 "Waimā kikō" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Shisō*, 230.
Fuji (collected essays). *Kōchō Shorin*, 25 Jul.
 "Ashiji mōde" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Nihon hyōron*, 16:8.
 "Shichiria no inshō" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kaizō*, 23:15.
 "Mikerañero no ie" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Chūō kōron*, 56:9.
 "Etona tozan" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Gendai*, 22:9.
 "Supein nikki" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Kaizō*, 23:21.
 "Firentse" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Nichi-i bunka kenkyū*, 3.
 "Shirakusa" (*Ōbei no tabi*). *Sedai*, 18.
- 1942 (57)
 "Meigetsu". *Chūō kōron*, 57:1.
 "Nara ni sumu tomo e". *Nara sōki*, Shinshindō Shoten, 10 Jan.
 "Tada kodomotachi o". *Fujin kōron*, 27:2.
 "Sono koro no omoide". *Fujin kōron*, 27:4.
Ōbei no tabi, jō. Iwanami Shoten, 15 May.
Yamanba (Hahakigi no uta, Maruo no shi, Yume, Unmei, Otsune no shōsetsu, Meigetsu). *Chūō kōronsha*, 10 Sep.
- 1943 (58)
 "Kanariya". *Fujin kōron*, 28:4.
Ōbei no tabi, ge. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Jun.
O-nō monogatari. Shōgakkan 1 Sep.
- 1944 (59) (Evacuated to Kita-Karuizawa from autumn.)
 "Kusawake". *Bungei*, 1:2.
- 1945 (60) (End of Second World War. House in Tokyo destroyed in air raid.)
 "Sansō-ki". *Nihon sōsho* 21, Seikatsusha, (10 Nov.).

1946 (61)

- "Yamabiko". *Bungei shunjū* 24:1.
 "Zoku sansō-ki". *Nihon sōsho* 33, Seikatsusha, (28 Feb.).
 "Marui tamago". *Shin nihon bungaku*, 1:1.
 "Satō". *Sekai*, 4.
 "Seiji e no kaigen". *Fujin kōron*, 30:1.
 "Jiyū to ren'ai" (later "Sansō yori"). *Josei*, 1:2, 1:3.
 "Sansō kanpitsu". *Chūō kōron*, 61:8.
 "Kitsune". *Kaizō* 27:11.
 "Nikki no issetsu". *Hototogisu*, 49:12.

1947 (62)

- "Kami sama". *Shinchō*, 44:1.
 "Tensei". *Ningen*, 2:2.
Yamabiko (collected essays). Seikatsusha, 15 Feb.
 "Sonya Kobarefusukaya". *Shinjoen*, from 11:3 to 11:8.
 "Fujin kōron kantōgen". *Fujin kōron*, from 31:3 to 43:12.
Meigetsu (Meigetsu, Cha-ryōri, Notsuke ushi, Kanashiki shōnen, Otsune no shōsetsu, Wakai musuko, Atogaki). Tōkyō Shuppan Kabushiki-gaisha, 10 Mar.
 "Seikatsu to eichi". *Josei kaizō*, 2:3.
 "Kagi". *Geirin kanpo*, 2:4.
Machiko. *Bungei shunjū Shinsha*, 15 Sep.
Kusawake (Kusa wake, Yamanba, Satō, Kitsune, Tensei, Kami sama). Koyama Shoten, 10 Dec.

1948 (63)

- "Watashi no shosai". *Fujin*, 2:1.
 "Sansō dokugo". *Shin nihon bungaku*, 2.
 "Watashi wa sensō o nikumu". *Fujin*, 2:8.
Meiro I. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Oct.
Kagi (Kagi, Rondon no yado, Chichioya to san'nin no musume, Kitsune). Jitsugyō no nihonsha, 1 Dec.
Meiro II. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Dec.

1949 (64)

- "Eshima Munemichi" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 37.
 "Arisutopaneesu - Onna no gikai". *Nihon dokusho shinbun*, 5 Jan..
Gendai Nihon shōsetsu taikai, 29 (Machiko). Kawade Shobō, 15 Jan.
 "Kokyo", "Oji", "Aoi yume" and "Kaikyō" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 40, 42, 44 and 46.
 "Gakkō wa katei no yōbō o mitashiuru ka". *Kindai kyōiku*, sōkangō.

1950 (65): (Death of husband.)

- "Hashi" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 49.
 "Shingen". *Josei kaizō*, 5:3.
 "Hansensha Munamichi" (later "Aki", *Meiro*). *Sekai*, 52.
 "Geijutsu, bunka, sesō, kuni no uchi-soto" (discussion). *Shin nihon bungaku*, 5:4.
 "Byōbu to bunka-shisetsu" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 56.
 "Kokoro". *Chūō kōron*, 65:8.
 "Futatsu no koe". *Josei kaizō*, 5:8.
 "Toruman daitōryō e no kōkaijō". *Kaizō*, 31:9.
 "Watashi no shinjō". *Sekai* 58.
 "Kodomotachi no dokusho". *Tosho*, 14.

1951 (66) (Death of close friend Miyamoto Yuriko.)

- "Natsu gumo" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 61.
 "Mudai". *Kanze*, 18:2.
 "Josei no me o sekai e" (interview). *Fujin kōron*, 37:2.
 "Miyamoto Yuriko san". *Shūkan Asahi*, 56:6.

- "Miyamoto Yuriko san o omou". *Fujin kōron*, 37:3.
 "Rafu" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 64.
 "Ningen Miyamoto Yuriko" (interview). *Bungakukai*, April.
 "Kojin no omoide". *Miyamoto Yuriko*, Iwasaki Shoten, 30 May.
 "Kichiuemon". *Fujin Kōron*, 37:6.
 "Kōmori" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 67.
 "Joryū sakka" (interview). *Kaizō*, 32:9.
 "Yama yori no tegami" and "Kōwa ni taisuru iken, hihan, kibō". *Sekai*, 69 and 70.
 "Kōwa to nihonjin" (discussion). *Fujin kōron*, 37:10.
 "Mariko" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 71.

1952 (67)

- "Ai" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 73.
 "Kokka to dōtoku". *Kaizō*, 33:1.
 "Gūkan". *Bungaku*, 20:2.
 "Rekishi" (*Meiro*) and "Kenbutsu Saemon no ki". *Sekai*, 76.
 "Konketsuji o kōfukuna michi e". *Fujin kōron*, 38:5.
Meiro III. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Jun.
 "Takahama san to watashi". *Haiku*, 1:2.
 "Keredomo konketsuji wa sodatte iku" (discussion). *Fujin kōron*, 38:7.
Meiro I and II. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Jul.
Meiro IV. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Jul.
 "Gake" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 80.
 "Yoi kyōkasho to wa". *Bungaku*, 20:8.
 "Yume ni inochi o". *Kaizō*, 33:12.
 "Heiwa o negau tabi no hōkoku" (discussion). *Fujin kōron*, 38:9.
 "Dochira no kuma san ni sansei nasaimasu ka". *Sekai*, 82.
 "Hitobashira". *Kurashi no techō*, 18.

1953 (68)

- "Nakasaka no shintaku" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 85.
 "Mushiro kugen o". *Bungei*, 10:3.
 "Nihon bunka no yoki hatten no tameni" (discussion). *Fujin kōron*, 39:3.
 "Ikiru to iu koto". *Fujin kōron*, 37:4.
 "Bunko no sokai". *Tosho*, 43.
 "Tsuiraku" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 89.
 "Hitokoto no uso mo nai seiji o". *Kaizō*, 34:6.
 "Heiwa no iji ni kansuru iken, hihan, kibō". *Sekai*, 89.
 "Yazaki san no omoide". *Tosho*, 44.
 "Nyūkāsuru no omoide". *Asahi shinbun*, 18 May.
Wakaki shimai yo ikani ikubeki ka. Iwanami Shoten, 23 May.
 "Bungaku to seikatsu". *Tosho*, 45.
Nogami Yaeko shū, Shimin bunko 13 (Kaijin-maru, Meigetsu, Kitsune). Kawade Shobō, 20 Jun.
 "Ano hi no zengo" (*Sansō-ki*) and "Tochū gesha" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 92 and 94.
Sansō-ki. *Kurashi no techōsha*, 1 Dec.

1954 (69)

- "Shingo no nōto" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 97.
 "Chadai-zushi to ōhan". *Kurashi no techō*, 23.
 "Aruhi no nikki". *Fujin kōron*, 39:3.
 "Aka-gami no hi" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 100.
 "Yama de no go-aisatsu". *Chūō kōron*, 69:4.
 "Futari no daimyō". *Bungei shunjū*, 32:7.
 "Suibaku to paeton". *Sekai*, 102.
 "Kuovadesu". *Takiji to Yuriko*, 4.

- "Sakka ni kiku". *Bungaku*, 22:6.
 "Shiryō chōhatsu tai". (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 105.
Meiro V. Iwanami Shoten, 20 Sep.
- 1955 (70)
 "Tō no aru oka" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 109.
 "Shinshun ni atatte". *Kaizō*, 36:1.
 "Sōma Kuromitsu san no koto". *Asahi shinbun*, 4 Mar.
 "Watashi ga jogakusei jidai ni mita Uchimura san". *Uchimura Kanzo chosakushū* 20, *Geppō* 20.
 "Chō sensei" and "Furiko" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 113 and 118.
 "Mēdē mita mama no ki". *Sekai*, 115.
 "Fujin kōron no shimei". *Fujin kōron*, 40:10.
Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshū 28 (Kaijin-maru, Ōishi Yoshitomo, Wakai musuko, Kanashiki shōnen, Meigetsu, Kitsune). Chikuma Shobō, 15 Oct.
 "Natsume sensei no nikki ni tsuite". *Shin nihon bungaku*, 10:11.
- 1956 (71)
 "Dassō [1]" and "Dassō [2]" (*Meiro*). *Sekai*, 121 and 125.
 "Aru gogo no taiwa". *Hōsei*, 5-6.
 "Musubi". *Kurashi no techō*, 36.
 "Hakobune no hito" (*Meiro*) and "Meiro o owatte" (interview). *Sekai*, 130 and 132.
Meiro VI. Iwanami Shoten, 26 Nov.
 "Meiro o owatte" (interview). *Sekai*, 132.
- 1957 (72)
 "Yama yori no tegami" (later "Tabi no omoide ni eizuru Ejiputo, Hangaria"). *Sekai*, 133.
 "Rekishiteki genjitsu to sōzō - Meiro o megutte" (interview). *Bungei*, 14:6.
 "Chin san no meishi to tegami". *Bungei shunjū*, 35:4.
 "Meiro no kai no ki". *Sekai*, 137.
 "Sekai o gensuibaku no hai de yogosuna" (discussion). *Fujin kōron*, 42:5.
 "Ichiju no kage". *Hōsei*, 6:6.
 "Nō to bungaku" (discussion). *Tōkyō shinbun*, from 4 to 6 Jun.
 "Gecchingen sengen o megutte". *Sekai*, 139.
 "Chūgoku sakka kyōkai ni manekarete". *Asahi shinbun*, 3 Aug.
 "En'an o tazunete". *Tosho*, 95.
 "Atarashiku katsu furui Chūgoku". *Fujin kōron*, 42:9.
 "En'an kikō, 1, 2 and 3" (later "Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō"). *Sekai*, from 142 to 144.
 "Mondō yūyō" (interview). *Shūkan Asahi*, 62:43.
- 1958 (73)
 "Hatsu-yume". *Tōkyō shinbun*, 2 Jan.
 "Hiroshima ni tsuite". *Tosho*, 100.
 "Kono nenrei de omoigakenaku". *Yomiuri shinbun*, 27 Jan.
Kokumin no kotoba (collected essays). *Gendai kokumin bungaku zenshū* 18, Kadokawa Shoten, 15 Feb.
 "Pekin no kangoku" (*Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō*). *Sekai*, 147.
 "Kūjussai no sensei" (later "Kūjussai no Natsume sensei"). *Gendai nihon bungaku zenshū*, 65, *Geppō*, 88, Chikuma Shobō, 20 Apr.
Meiro (1). Iwanami bunko, 25 Apr.
 "Kodō no ie" (*Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō*). *Sekai*, 149, 151.
 "Iwanami Shigeo den o megutte" (discussion). *Kokoro*, 11:5.
 "Ningen no kenbōshō e no keikoku". *Shūkan Dokushojin*, 5 May.
Meiro (2), (3), (4). Iwanami bunko, 5 and 26 May and 5 Jun.
 "Daidō to Unkō" (*Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō*). *Sekai*, 154.
 "Kyōjin na tatakai". *Chūō kōron*, 73:12.

1959 (74)

- "Kōshū" (*Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō*). *Sekai*, 158.
Watashi no Chūgoku ryokō. Iwanami shinsho, 17 Feb.
 "Sakurama Yumikawa san no san-shūki ni omou" (later "Sakurama Yumikawa san no koto"). *Tōkyō shinbun*, from 25 to 28 Feb.
 "Watashi no sanpomichi". *Bessatsu Bungei shunjū*, 68.
 "Kōtaishi no go-seikon ni omou". *Fujin kōron*, 44:5.
 "Furushichofu fujin no motarashita kakumei". *Sekai*, 167.
 "Sansō yori". *Hōsei joshi gakuen nenpō*, VI.
 "Nihonjin no warai". *Sekai*, 168.

1960 (75)

- "Shinshun kanwa" (later "Nō-men kanwa") and "Kimaie no yoi koto kana". *Sekai*, 169 and 170.
 "Sansō zakki". *Bungakukai*, 14:2.
 "Kagi-jūji to anpo kaitei" and "Yaki-udon no keizai". *Sekai*, 171 and 172.
 "Shunshū" (later "Hōshō Shin sensei no koto"). *Asahi shinbun*, 18 Apr.
 "Shunchū" and "Beikoku iki no 'harakiri'". *Sekai*, 173 and 174.
Meiro, jō. Kadokawa bunko. 20 Jun.
 "Washinton to sakura no ki". *Sekai*, 175.
 "Tenmō kaikai so ni shite morasazu". *Sekai*, 176.
Meiro, chū. Kadokawa bunko. 10 Aug.
 "Fukō de saiwai na hi". *Yomiuri shinbun*, 15 Aug.
 "Hitotsu no teian", "Namae no iroiro", "Storeeruka to Beeruka ni warawareru na", "Bōryoku no ne wa fukai". *Sekai*, 177, 178, 179, 180.
Meiro, ge. Kadokawa bunko. 10 Sep.

1961 (76)

- "Miyamoto Yuriko san no koto". *Takiji to Yuriko*, 9:1.
 "Shin'nyūsei e". *Hōsei joshi gakuen nenpō*, bessatsu.
 "Dōkutsu no macni Enan" and "Kekkon to jinsei". *Fujin kōron*, 46:9 and 46:13.
 "Bundan yomoyama banashi" (discussion). NHK, 25 Dec.

1962 (77)

- Hideyoshi to Rikyū*. *Chūō kōron*, from 77:1 to 78:9.
 "Te". *Asahi shinbun*, 5 Jan.
 "Kimyō na angō". *Sekai*, 194.
 "Kaijin-maru" (essay). *Asahi shinbun*, 27 Mar.
 "Iki no yoi o-kyaku san". *Sekai*, 196.
 "Nōgaku yawa" (discussion). *Kokoro*, 15:4.
 "Muzukashikatta senkō". *Fujin kōron*, 47:6.
 "Sotsugyōsei no minasan e". *Hōsei joshi gakuen nenpō*, bessatsu.
 "Sansō zakki" (later "Kodama"). *Asahi shinbun*, from 8 to 16 Oct.
Shōwa bungaku zenshū, 2 (Meiro). Kadokawa Shoten, 15 Nov.
Kaijin-maru. Kadokawa bunko. 5 Dec.

1963 (78)

- "Kansei no bi to mikan no miryoku". *Fujin kōron*, 48:6.
 "1961-nen natsu" (lecture). *Asama*, 2.
 "Watashi no cha-zanmai". *Sadō taikē*, 1, Geppō, 20 Oct.
 "Namae no majutsu". *Fujin kōron*, 48:12.
 "Karuizawa seidan". *Hōsei*, September, October.

1964 (79)

- "Mittsu no Pieta". *Sekai*, 218.
Hideyoshi to Rikyū. *Chūō kōron sha*, 8 Feb.
 "Kirishitan daimyō no koseki". *Iwanami kōza, Nihon no rekishi*, 13, Geppō 23.
 "Sōshun zakki" (later "Fushigina kanji no manabi-kata"). *Tosho*, 175.

- "Watashi to Anna Karēnina", *Sekai no bungaku*, 20, Geppō 14, Chuō kōronsha, 12 Mar.
 "Kiroku no danpen". *Tetsugaku kenkyū*, 42:7.
 "Hae aru mono ni, go-hen o yonde". *Fujin kōron*, 49:5.
 "Sōshun yowa" (interview). *Tosho*, 177.
 "Takeda san". *Shōwa bungaku zenshū*, 20, Geppō.
 "Sensei no o-kōgi o don'na fūni kiitaka" (later "Tanabe sensei no go-kōgi"). *Tanabe Hajime zenshū*, 14, Geppō 14, Chikuma Shobō, 30 Jun.
 "Konogoro hisoka ni ureuru koto". *Bungei shunjū*, 42:7.
 "Natsume Sōseki". *Bungei shunjū*, 42:8.
Kijo sanbō ki (collected essays). Iwanami Shoten, 20 Aug.
 "Hataraku hahaoya ni tsuite". *Fujin kōron*, 49:9.
 "Fue". *Shinchō*, 61:10.
 "Sanbō zakki" (later "Yamabiko"). *Tenbō*, 72.

1965 (80)

- "Suwa watari". *Asahi shinbun*, 3 Jan.
 "Nikki ni tsuite". *Kafū zenshū*, 26, Geppō 25.
Nihon gendai bungaku zenshū, 63 (Kaijin-maru, Cha-ryōri, Ōishi Yoshitomo, Wakai musuko, Kitsune, Fue). Kōdansha, 19 Feb.
 "Hajimete Ōsuchin o yonda hanashi". *Sekai no bungaku*, 6, Geppō 27, Chuō kōronsha, 12 Apr.
 "Ima nani o nasu beki ka". *Sekai*, 234.
 "Shoshin wasuru bekarazu". *Muginoho*, 19.
 "Betomanu no senka ni omou". *Fujin kōron*, 50:6.
 "Waga hansei". *Sekai*, 239.
Nihon no bungaku, 44 (Hideyoshi to Rikyū, Cha-ryōri, Kanashiki shōnen). Chuō kōronsha, 5 Oct.
 "Joryū-bungaku to sakka seikatsu" (interview). *Nihon no bungaku*, 44, Geppō 21.
 "Josei no kōfuku no arikata o Nogami Yaeko shi ni kiku" (interview). *Fujin kōron*, 50:11.
 "Josei to bungaku" (interview). *Fujin no tomo*, 59:11.

1966 (81)

- "Suzuran". *Sekai*, 242.
 "Tenkanin no jōken" (interview). *Nihon no rekishi*, 12, Geppō, Chuō kōronsha, 15 Jan.
 "Natsume sensei no omoide". *Chuō kōron*, 81:5.
Kanashiki shōnen (Kaijin-maru, Koyubi, Ōishi Yoshitomo, Kanashiki shōnen, Hahaoya no tsūshin, Kataashi no mondai). Kaiseisha, 20 May.
Fue, Suzuran. Iwanami Shoten, 15 Jun.
 "Abe san no koto samazama". *Sekai*, 249.
 "Natsume fujin tonokoto". *Sōseki zenshū*, 11, Geppō 11.
Machiko. Shinchō bunko, 30 Nov.

1967 (82)

- "Tsuma to haha to sakka no tōitsu ni ikita jinsei" (interview). *Fujin kōron*, 52:1.
Gendai bungaku taikai, 24 (Machiko, Meigetsu). Chikuma Shobō, 10 Feb.
 "Egoizumu no ōsōji". *Chuō kōron*, 82:4.
 "Ichigū no ki". *Shinchō*, 64:5.
 "Hideyoshi to Rikyū o meguru" (interview). *Tankō*, 21:5.
 "Are mo kore mo kakitai" (interview). *Mainichi shinbun*, 22 May.
 "Shunkyō". *Asahi shinbun PR-ban*, 11 and 25 Jun.
 "Mokuyō kai no koto". *Nihon bungaku zenshū*, 6, Geppō, Kawade Shobō, 20 Jun.

1968 (83)

- "Hatsuyume". *Asahi Shinbun*, 5 Jan.
 "Aruhi no taiwa" (interview). *Misuzu*, 10:2.

"Natte hoshii yoi ningen, yoi shakaijin, yoi nihonjin" (later "Isshō o tsūzuru kenkyū o").
Muginoho, 31.

"'Kaijin-maru' gojitsu monogatari". *Bungaku*, 36:6.

Ichigū no ki (collected essays). Shinchōsha, 30 Aug.

Nihon bungaku zenshū, 34 (Kaijin-maru, Cha-ryōri, Ōishi Yoshitomo, Kanashiki shōnen, Kitsune, Machiko). Shueisha, 12 Oct.

Hideyoshi to Rikyū. Chūō kōronsha, 28 Nov.

1969 (84)

"Ikiru to iu koto". *Fujin no tomo*, 63:1.

Nihon tanpen bungaku zenshū, 18 (Satō, Cha-ryōri, Notsuke ushi). Chikuma Shobō, 15 Jan.

"Yama yori no tegami". *Sekai*, from 281 to 283.

Hideyoshi to Rikyū. Shinchō bunko, 25 Sep.

"Yūmoa wa honshitsu-teki". *Fujin kōron*, 54:5.

"Shi to shinjitsu" (interview). *Yūrin*, 23.

"Fuhennaru nomo". *Joshi kyōiku no kensetsu o mizashite*, 5 Nov.

1970 (85)

"Omoikосу 'Kyōeiken' kōsō". *Sekai*, 290.

"Nogami-ke san-dai ōini kataru". *Asahi shinbun*, 1 Jan.

"Masani shigei". *Fujin kōron*, 55:5.

Kaijin-maru. Iwanami bunko, 17 Aug.

"Subako". *Asahi shinbun*, 14 Sep. to 5 Oct.

1971 (86)

"Yuriko san to watashi". *Akahata*, 17 Jan.

Nihon bungaku taikei, 36 (Hideyoshi to Rikyū, Meigetsu). Chikuma Shobō, 25 Feb.

"Eriseefu san kara no tayori o megutte" (later "Eriseefu san kara no tayori"). *Tosho*, 260.

"Rōjo-mono no fuzei". *Fujin kōron*, 56:5.

Gendai Nihon no bungaku 8 (Machiko). Gakushū kenkyūsha, 1 Aug.

"Ryokuin kanwa" (interview). *Gendai hihon no bungaku*, 8, Geppō 45.

"Watashi ga mottomo eikyō o uketa shōsetsu". *Bungei shunjū*, 49:16.

Onna de aru mae ni mazu ningen de are (collected essays). Hōsei Daigaku Joshi Chū-kōtō gakkō, 15 Dec.

1972 (87)

"Mori". *Shinchō*, 69:5.

"Yama yori no tegami" (later "Yama-goya nite"). *Iwanami Hall Tomo*, 52.

"Mukōgaoka no ie" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 69:11.

Nihon kindai bungaku taikei 48 (Kaijin-maru). Kadokawa Shoten, 15 Oct.

"Kansō". *Fujin kōron*, 57:11.

"Watashi ni totte Meiji to wa nande atta ka". *Bungei shunjū*, 50:15.

Mukashi gateri (Chichioya to san'nin no musume, Aru otoko no tabi, Kaijin-maru, 'Kaijin-maru' gojitsu monogatari, Cha-ryōri, Ōishi Yoshitomo, Kanashiki shōnen, Kusawake, Kitsune, 'Mugashi gatari' kaisetsu), Horupusha, 1 Dec.

1973 (88)

"O-shōgatsu sama". *Asahi shinbun*, 6 Jan.

"Kurisumasu" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 70:3.

"Shunkan". *Tosho*, 286.

"Yume futatabi" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 70:7.

"Shaseibun e no yorokobi to kitai". *Teihon, Takahama Kyoshi zenshū*, naiyō mihon.

"Kansō". *Fujin kōron*, 58:11.

Hideyoshi to Rikyū. Chūō shinsho, 10 Nov.

1974 (89)

"Awai kioku". *Bungaku yomoyama-banashi, jō*.

"Haru no wakare" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 71:3.

- "Rokuin kandan" (interview). *Umi*, 6:6.
 "Kyodai na ritsuzō", *Sōseki zenshū*, naiyō mihon, Nov.
 "Nihon to Nihonjin". *Shinano Mainichi shinbun*, 1 Dec.
- 1975 (90)
 "'Neko' funshitsu no ki". *Nami*, 9:1.
 "Tobira" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 72:1.
 "Meiro no Nogami Yaeko san ni kiku" (interview). *Mingei no nakama*, 253.
 "Meiji, Taishō, Shōwa no nō o kataru" (interview). *Nōgaku taimuzu*, 279.
 "Karasu no ko" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 72:9.
 "Chūō kōron to bungaku". *Chūō kōron*, 90:11.
 "Kansō". *Fujin kōron*, 60:11.
- 1976 (91)
 "Bungaku, rekishi, bunmei" (interview). *Asahi shinbun*, 3 Jan.
 "Yomoyama-banashi" (interview). *Sekai*, 367.
 "Kumogakure" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 73:8.
 "Kansō". *Fujin kōron*, 61:11.
- 1977 (92)
 "Natsume Sōseki". *Umi*, 9:1.
 "Uno san no koto" (later "Uno Kōzō san no koto"). *Tosho*, 332.
 "Aru doiyōbi no gogo" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 74:5.
 "Daigakumura kusawake no koro" (later "Kusawake no koro, senchū, sengo").
 Daigakumura dayori 1.
 "Mado to onboro gakki". *Nami*, 11:7.
 "Bungaku to shisō" (interview). *Hōsei*, 4:6.
Hana (collected essays). *Shinchōsha*, 15 Oct.
- 1978 (93)
Wakai musuko (Wakai musuko, O-jō san, Kanashiki shōnen). *Shin Nihon bunko*, 30 Jan.
 "Jū to iu kazu". *Iwanami Hall Tomo*, 109.
 "Honno hitokoto". *Chikuma gendai bungaku taikei*, 97, Geppō 70.
 "Omoidasu koto samazama". *Tosho*, 344.
 "Basha wa dareka ga hikanebanaranai" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 75:4.
 "Sōnya Kobarefusukaya no koto". *Tosho*, 348.
- 1979 (94)
 "Bungakushi no yohaku ni" (interview). *Umi*, 11:1.
 "Nogami Yaeko sensei o kakonde" (discussion). *Hōsei Daigaku Hyaku-nen-shi Hensan Iinkai*, 20 Mar.
 "Tōi hanabi" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 76:6.
 "Yuriko san no koto". *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, 2, Geppō 6.
 "En no fushigi". *Muginoho*, 81.
- 1980 (95)
 "Asanaga san to Kita-Karu". *Misuzu*, 22:2.
 "Hame-e-gurasu no onna" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 77:4.
 "Ōuchi san no koto", "Gogo no taiwa" (interview). *Tosho*, 370.
 "Kusawake no koro, senchū, sengo". *Daigaku-mura gojū-nen-shi*, 30 Jun.
 "Fujito ni tsuite". *Mōri Kikue kiju kinen, Gekidan Kurumiza, dai gojūgo-kai kōen, panfuretto*, October.
 "Yamanba hitorigoto". *Chūō kōron*, 95:15.
 "Rekishi kara bunka o manabu" (interview). *Let's Love Oita*, 4.
- 1981 (96)
 "Mukashi no hanashi, ima no hanashi" (interview). *Umi*, 13:1.
 "Omoide no naka no hitobito" (interview). *Chishiki*, 23.
 "Gake" (Mori). *Shinchō*, 78:8.

"Omoide iroiro" (discussion). *Nōgaku zensho*, 6.

Shinchō gendai bungaku, 4, (Hideyoshi to Rikyū, Ichigū no ki, Yama yori no tegami, Mado to onboro gakki, Natsume sensei no omoide). Shinchōsha, 15 Nov.

1982 (97) (Eye operation in November.)

"Shiena no musume" (*Mori*). *Shinchō*, 79:6.

1984 (99)

"Shunrai" (*Mori*). *Shinchō*, 81:1.

"Furusato no rekishi to ai" (interview). *Let's Love Oita*, (10 Aug.)

"Atarashiki onna to josei no Kirisuto-zō" (interview). *Chūō kōron bungei tokushū*, shūki-gō.

1985 (99) (Died on 30 March at the age of ninety-nine.)

"Sansō kandan" (interview). *Tosho*, (June).

"Omoidasu kotodomo". *Chūō kōron*, 100:6.

"Shunrai [continued]" (*Mori*). *Shinchō*, 82:6.